



CC #12,000











THE

*Sam. J. Miller.*

**Manchester**

# **SOCINIAN CONTROVERSY;**

WITH

**INTRODUCTORY REMARKS,**

AND

**AN APPENDIX.**

---

“ It is required in Stewards, that a man be found faithful.”

*1 Cor. iv. 2.*

“ Qui autem omnia metiuntur emolumentis et commodis, neque ea volunt præponderari honestate, hi solent in deliberando honestum cum eo, quod utile putant, comparare; boni viri non solent. Itaque existimo, Panæctium, quum dixerit, homines solere in hac comparatione dubitare, hoc ipsum sensisse, quod dixerit, solere modò; non etiam oportere: etenim non modò pluri putare quod utile videatur, quàm quod honestum, sed hæc etiam inter se comparare, et in his addubitare, turpissimum est.”

*Cicero de Officiis, Lib. iii.*

---

LONDON: ✓

**PRINTED FOR FRANCIS WESTLEY,**

10, STATIONERS' COURT, AND AVE-MARIA LANE, AND SOLD

BY C. J. WESTLEY AND G. TYRRELL,

11, LOWER SACKVILLE STREET, DUBLIN

---

1825.



## ADVERTISEMENT.



*The Appendix to this Publication contains, a LIST of the CHAPELS in ENGLAND, WALES, and SCOTLAND, now in the possession of UNITARIANS; an ACCOUNT of the MANCHESTER COLLEGE, YORK; and of the CHARITIES of DR. DANIEL WILLIAMS and LADY HEWLEY.*

## ERRATA.

- Page 34, line 36, *dele* the first *and*.  
40, Note, for *Colleges*, read *College*.  
48, line 31, for *this*, read *their*.  
73, 15, for *anxiliary*, read *auxiliary*.  
126, 1, for *Middeton*, read *Middleton*.  
135, Note, for *Berry*, read *Bury*.  
153, line 1, for *Rawtonstall*, read *Rawtonstale*.

## INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.



THE occasion of the following Publication is an important part of its history. An Unitarian minister having intimated his intention to remove from Manchester, his friends resolved to testify and alleviate their sorrow on account of his departure, by presenting to him "A SILVER TEA SERVICE," and by accompanying that presentation with extraordinary solemnities. As the Reverend Gentleman's removal was no less a public than a private calamity, and according to one of his admirers, equivalent to "the death of a Roman Emperor," the public grief was proportionally intense: and as "a Tea Service of Silver" is "a noble present," according to Mr. Grundy himself, a testimonial of regard immemorially superior to any given by a Congregation to a Minister before, a public Meeting was indispensable, and a public Meeting was accordingly decreed.

Why a public Dinner, which necessarily excluded the Ladies, was preferred to a public Déjeûné, or rather Tea, which might have been enlivened and adorned by their presence, and why the "Silver Tea Service" was given to Mr. Grundy by the

gentlemen, instead of being presented to Mrs. Grundy by her female friends, although questions of great delicacy and interest, unhappily are not now to be answered ; and the anxieties so natural in an affair of such moment, can receive only the allay of plausible conjecture.

Yet the Ladies may be allowed to remark, that the introduction of a Tea Service, even though “ a Tea Service of Silver,” was not perfectly appropriate at a Dinner, or calculated to exhibit the gift to its best advantage ; and to suggest, that for gentlemen to reciprocate Tea-things in the absence of those who alone could impart to the ceremony its propriety and expression, has very much the air of a design to invade the Female prerogative.

Uninfluenced by these considerations, important as they are, the party assembled, the dinner took place, and on the removal of the cloth, the “ noble present” was introduced. On its appearance, the Chairman rose “ *much affected* ;” but having discharged the duty of transmitting it to the custody of the person for whom it was designed, he dried his tears, recovered his feelings, and gave the tone to the Meeting in a speech composed of strong animadversions on the memory of the Reverend Gentleman’s deceased predecessors, and some compliments quite of the tea-table sort, to the Reverend Gentleman himself. The guests in their order, adopted the complimentary style of their President, with the exception of Mr. Naylor, the incense offered by whom, was worthy to have perfumed “ a Silver Service” for DINNER.

The hero of that evening, however, was not Mr.



Grundy, nor was it more than the ostensible object of that meeting, to give him a public farewell. Had not other purposes and designs developed themselves in the published addresses of the persons then assembled, their flight to immortality or their descent to oblivion, had been alike undisturbed and unremarked. The principal part was actually assigned to the Rev. G. Harris, of Bolton-le-Moors, a man distinguished by his ardour and efforts on behalf of that anomaly which its advocates choose to denominate "Unitarian Christianity." So mighty is he, that he undertakes in a pamphlet of the common dimensions, to demolish a long list of Orthodox opponents; and so accomplished, notwithstanding the coarseness of his Speech, that he is a public lecturer on polite literature. In fact, Mr. Harris is regarded as a pure specimen of the thoroughgoing undisguised Unitarian; and his hosts for that day, meditating an attack upon the principles of Orthodoxy, were aware that their dinner would be insipid and their speeches tame, without a prevailing infusion of "the zeal which the Rev. G. Harris has been instrumental in kindling." Nor did he deceive their expectations. They gave him the appointed Toast, and he gave them the Harangue which he had prepared for the occasion,\* a harangue so adapted to the taste of his hearers, that the liveliness of their sympathy exploded in a tumult of applause. The true character and design of that speech are as evident as the purpose for which its composition

\* See Mr. Harris's Speech, p. 8.

and delivery were solicited : but it is possible, that the conductors of the Meeting, did not then foresee all the consequences in which it would result.

The provocation by which the Unitarians of Manchester were induced to offer through this individual, so gross and outrageous an attack on the professors of Evangelical religion, remains undisclosed. Why the subject was at all introduced, and why, if unnecessarily and in bad taste introduced, it was made an occasion for the display of hatred and scorn, no one but themselves can tell. Mr. G. W. Wood in his first letter which he signs "An Unitarian Christian," says "that the Unitarians as a body are not deficient in a spirit of kindness and charity towards their Orthodox brethren;" and adds "Perhaps they do not always meet with a return of that good will, which it is their *earnest wish* and *uniform endeavour* to exhibit towards others:" but how does this consist with the character of the very meeting which sanctioned and adopted the speech of Mr. Harris? How do these statements of Mr. Wood accord with the fact, that one hundred and twenty Unitarians, of whom several are ministers, assemble professedly for the purposes of friendship and valediction : but although nothing occurs, or is known to have occurred, to irritate the temper or to provoke discussion, and at the very moment when their hearts might be supposed to be susceptible of the kindlier influences, they break out into the most opprobrious language (which they afterwards publish in a Newspaper) concerning all those from whom they differ in religious sentiment,

and whose absence ought to have been, for that time at least, their protection?

If indeed the whole of these proceedings were devised and arranged, under the disguise of good fellowship, for the very purpose of making a demonstration of hostility against the Orthodox, and by accusing them of being actuated by every vicious principle, to bring upon them the public indignation; then are the Unitarians justly rewarded. They have brought on themselves detection and exposure; they are smarting from the recoil of their own weapons;—their own firebrands have kindled their own premises;—they have “made a pit and digged it, and are fallen into the ditch which they made.”—*Ps.* vii. 15.

Had the Unitarians shared as much as was previously supposed, in the general increase of light and of liberal feeling, they would have obeyed the dictates of good breeding, even if they had refused to yield to emotions of good will: but these proceedings throw us ages back, and convince us, that whatever Unitarians may be as individuals, as a body they have been slow to improve in the observances of well regulated society;—and that they have much to learn and much to feel, before they will occupy the same degree on the social scale with other denominations. To this tardiness of improvement alone, could it be owing, that by the cold and artificial ceremony of a Toast, to the very persons whom they subsequently accused of every thing immoral, unjust, and impious, they invested insult with mockery, and infused wormwood in a cup which was more than sufficiently bitter before.

It will occasion no surprise that an outrage so premeditated and offered under such circumstances, immediately attracted the notice of the Orthodox inhabitants of Manchester, and a letter soon appeared in the Newspaper\* which recorded those proceedings, referring particularly to the Speech of Mr. Harris, denying the accusations it conveyed, and giving to his constituents the opportunity of disclaiming its spirit and terms. Every overture to that effect has been disregarded by the only competent authorities, and these accusations gross and false as they are, remain as much as they were in August last, the obloquy of the Unitarians against the Orthodox.

The vindication of the Orthodox from charges as groundless as they are malicious, very naturally led to some inquiries concerning those by whom they were thus calumniated. The Unitarians have claimed almost a monopoly of moral feeling and social rectitude, their delight has been to declaim after the manner of Mr. Harris on "the direful and demoralizing effects of Orthodoxy," as if they, and they alone, had pure hearts and clean hands: but how does their boasting endure an impartial scru-

\* To prevent misconception, and in justice to Mr. Archibald Prentice, the Editor of the Manchester Gazette in which these proceedings were published, it should be mentioned that he has no religious connexion with the Unitarians, but is an Elder of the Scotch Secession Church in Manchester. From a little volume which he has lately published entitled "The life of a Scottish Covenanter," it appears that Mr. P. is the great grandson of Archibald Prentice and Alexander Reid, both of whom fought on the side of the Covenanters, in the disastrous engagement at Bothwell Bridge, in 1679.

tiny?—in what is their system founded?—and by what do they uphold it? These inquiries naturally introduced that which soon became the principal and absorbing topic of the Correspondence, viz. *The misappropriation of those funds and endowments, which were bequeathed by Orthodox persons for Orthodox purposes, but which have unhappily fallen into the hands of Unitarian Trustees.* For the elucidation of the PRINCIPLE of Unitarianism, the Reader is referred to the late Rev. Andrew Fuller's "Calvinistic and Socinian systems compared with respect to their Moral Tendency;" and for the PRACTICAL OPERATION of that Principle, he is referred to the following Correspondence, and the papers which compose the Appendix.

A Controversy on topics so interesting to every friend of justice, and especially to the Dissenting Body, was not long before it excited attention considerably beyond the circle of those who were immediately concerned; and the Evangelical Magazine for January, 1825, contained the following clear and compendious statement, viz.

#### UNITARIAN CHAPELS.

"From a spirited controversy, commencing last August, and still continued in the columns of the *Manchester Gazette*, it appears that the self-styled Unitarians are undergoing a very severe but most deserved castigation. The brief history of the case is as follows:—Upwards of a hundred Gentlemen of that denomination held a friendly convivial meeting at the Spread Eagle Tavern, for the purpose of presenting a service of plate to their minister, the Rev. John Grundy, as a token of respect, on the occasion of

his removal from Manchester to Liverpool. Among the number of toasts in the course of the evening, the health of the Rev. George Harris, formerly of Liverpool, now of Bolton, was proposed and received with acclamation. The Reverend Gentleman, in acknowledging the honour conferred upon him, took occasion to eulogize Unitarian Christianity contrasted with Orthodoxy, in a long list of particulars: epithet was heaped upon epithet, to show that the former is the paragon of excellence, and that the latter is below contempt. This speech was received at every point with thunders of applause; and that the impression might not die with the moment, nor be confined to the select assembly present, the report of the meeting, of the several speeches, and particularly that of Mr. Harris, was *Gazetted*, with the minutest accuracy, on the following Saturday.

This recorded specimen of Manchester Unitarianism produced a most astounding effect. "An Orthodox Dissenter" indignantly, but temperately replied, appealing to Mr. Harris's own speech as the most direct refutation, both of his gross calumnies and his vaunting pretences. "Another Orthodox Dissenter" followed up the charge, with "An Orthodox Observer" and others in the rear.

At the very commencement of the controversy, the Unitarian fraternity perceived that their zeal had betrayed them, and that the speech of their applauded orator did not sound so harmoniously in the ears of the public as it had done in their own. In their replies therefore, they deprecated all further discussion, sounded a retreat, acknowledged the intemperance of Mr. Harris, and expressed their readiness to toss him overboard, to sink or swim, responsible for his own opinions and expressions, if the impending storm might be thereby allayed. These concessions,\* however, connected as they were with Unitarian bravado, have been hitherto unavailing.

In the management of the Controversy, the Orthodox party have wisely abstained from theological discussion, as

\* These were the concessions of individual Writers---the DINNER AUTHORITIES were completely silent.

unsuited to a Newspaper. They have confined their attacks principally to two distinct points, shewing by reference to historic facts, first, That Unitarians are not entitled to that claim of candour, of liberality, and of steadfast adherence to the principles of civil and religious liberty of which they boast:—and secondly, That however respectable they may be in their private commercial concerns, they do, as a body, most flagrantly violate the principles of moral integrity, by the mal-administration of trusts, appropriating to the support of their own system numerous chapels, with endowments and funds to a vast amount, originally intended for Orthodox purposes. In confirmation of this charge, the List of Chapels occupied by Unitarians in Cheshire, Lancashire, Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire, and the West Riding of Yorkshire, is reported to be *eighty*, of these *sixty-nine* were originally orthodox; *three* are doubtful; and *eight* only of Unitarian origin.

Should this controversy hereafter appear in the form of a pamphlet, it will deserve a careful review. It has already we are informed, produced a very wide and powerful impression; and we apprehend, it will ultimately lead to the rescue of property to a considerable amount, from the trust of Unitarians, by legal process, except they adopt the more honourable alternative of voluntarily surrendering it to the purposes for which it was originally intended.”

In “The Monthly Repository of Theology and General Literature,” which has long been the official periodical publication of the English Unitarians, and the organ of their sentiments, this paper in the Evangelical Magazine, is noticed in the following highly significant language, which will afford the reader an example of that rigid morality, sobriety of temper, and modesty of expression, by which Unitarianism is invariably distinguished.

## “ EVANGELICAL” DECLARATION OF WAR AGAINST THE UNITARIANS.

“ The “ Evangelical Magazine” ushers in the new year with sounding *the war-whoop of bigotry and persecution*. For a long time this Work represented the “ Socinians’ as dwindled to nothing ; with but few chapels, (places of *worship* they would hardly be called,) and those nearly empty. This artifice failing, and in despair of answering Unitarian arguments, it is now seriously proposed to the *Evangelical* world to *try to rob* Unitarians of their Meeting-houses !

The notable project has been started in Lancashire, in the course of a Newspaper controversy growing out of the report of proceedings at the Dinner given to Mr. Grundy, at Manchester, (See Mon. Repos. xix. p. 574.) It is taken up deliberately in the “ Evangelical” for this Month in an article of Intelligence headed (not Socinian, but) “ Unitarian Chapels” from which we shall now extract a passage (pp. 23, 24.) to which we beg the reader’s attention. [*Here a part of the preceding Article from the Evangelical Magazine, is introduced.*]

Having recorded this specimen of intolerance and persecution, as far as the mind of the conductors of the Evangelical Magazine is concerned, we are contented. *It would be ridiculous to argue against the principle* assumed in the menace, it would be worse than ridiculous to say a word upon the result of the meditated “ legal process.” Let the Calvinists begin their holy war, and they will then understand “ the signs of the times.” But the only thing of consequence, at present, is to set down in print the memorable design. Here, in the 19th century, in the metropolis of Great Britain, in a Magazine supported chiefly by Protestant Dissenters, a Magazine too which professes to be, by way of distinction, “ Evangelical,” and to be devoted peculiarly to vital Christianity : in this Work, at this time of day, it is proposed to drive a multitude of Protestant



Dissenting Congregations (not less than seventy in one district) out of their places of worship inherited from their fathers, because it is alleged they do not believe all that their fathers believed! It is intended of course that the emptied chapels shall be occupied and their endowments be enjoyed (here is the temptation) by the true believers; for *dominion is founded upon grace*. The *iniquity of the scheme* may pass: but *the cool blooded assurance* with which it is announced is instructive. This is the “Evangelical Magazine;” this is the spirit of some Calvinists; and this we are entitled to consider as the effect of Calvinism, unless the Dissenting Ministers, whose names are published as the contributors of the Work, and the distributors of its gains, come forward and disavow the Editor’s project of contending with Unitarians by “legal process” and of upholding and enriching Calvinism by a *sweeping ejectment and spoliation*.”

*Monthly Repository*, No. 229, p. 56.

When the patient writhes and screams beneath the probe, the surgeon knows that the ulcer is penetrated to its core; and nothing can be more intelligible and explicit than this Unitarian outcry. Certain trustees are required to administer uprightly the trusts to which they are appointed—nothing more than the faithful discharge of their duties is expected or desired—yet roused and irritated by a requirement so reasonable and so just, they exclaim “you declare *war* against us; you design *robbery*; you wish to enrich yourselves with our *spoils*.” If the property they hold in trust, be actually devoted to its legitimate purposes, they can have nothing to fear from “a legal process;”—why then are they so angry and so alarmed?

Nothing more is said to them than this; “Honestly administer the deeds which entrust you—keep by all means that which is your own; but restore that which you have taken away:” and this they stile “a declaration of *war*, a purpose of *robbery*, a design of *spoliation*!” They actually impute to the men who intreat them to be honest, a “*cool blooded assurance*!”

Is theirs the language of men safe and tranquil in the consciousness of integrity? Do faithful stewards when called to account for their stewardship, complain of injury? Why then do these ostentatious advocates of free inquiry, shrink and tremble at the mere proposal of investigation? Are these invectives the self-accusations of remorse?—and are we to receive these paragraphs as the PUBLIC CONFESSION OF THE CONSCIENCE-STRICKEN UNITARIANS? The dispassionate reader will determine, whether this be not indeed their own recorded plea of “GUILTY,” and whether they can evade the consequences of that plea.

It could not have been anticipated that the attempt to illustrate and enforce the simple but sacred and inviolable principle, that *it is the duty of all trustees to execute uprightly and faithfully their trust deeds*, would have excited this fierceness of resentment among those who boast of a rigid morality; and surely this principle which is of universal application, is not to be set aside in the case of those funds and endowments which were raised and settled by the Orthodox of former days, for the purpose of promoting the cause of Evangelical Truth. If when it is said to the actual

Trustees “fulfil the intentions of the founders, act only as you would wish succeeding Trustees to act supposing you yourselves to invest your property in trust,” they choose to meet this by the angry but candid confession, that to be thus faithful in the exercise of the confidence reposed in them, would necessitate an entire change from the present application of the funds (so much so as to be equivalent to a surrender of the property) let them not be surprised if to plain understandings, this confession amounts to a public acknowledgment that these funds are at the present moment, perverted and misapplied. It is not unreasonable therefore, to call upon them for restitution, when they have confessedly done wrong. They ought to think it no hardship to be as other Dissenters, who by their own voluntary contributions, support their own respective systems: but they ought to feel that it is grievous, that it is iniquitous in the sight of God and man, to usurp and misappropriate the bequests and endowments of the pious dead.

Let them build and endow as many chapels as they please,—let them employ every fair and honest method to disseminate their opinions,—let them plant vines and fig-trees, and sit unmolested beneath them: but why do they retain the vines and fig-trees of which the rightful owners have been dispossessed?—why do they continue to occupy vineyards, which are not, and cannot be, justly theirs? If indeed these trustees are prepared to assert, that there is no departure from the intentions of the Founders,—that there is no dereliction of the letter or the spirit of the Deeds,

and to substantiate that assertion by an unreserved exhibition of the necessary documents,—we are quite open to conviction. And, when they have thus shewn that all the Chapels they occupy were built and endowed by Unitarians, and that all the Benefactions they enjoy, were settled in Trust for the propagation of Unitarian doctrines, our applauses shall accompany their vindication, and we shall claim their gratitude as the reward of our exertions in this Inquiry. But this is notoriously impossible; and they have not even attempted to deny the charge.

Yet although they practically admit the truth and justice of the statements made against them, and actually acknowledge that “*it would be ridiculous to argue against the PRINCIPLE*”\* we maintain, they endeavour to engage on their side the feelings of the charitable and humane, by accusing of harshness and severity, those who press upon them the duty of faithfully discharging their Trusts. Their complaint is, that they are to be driven out of “places of worship inherited from their fathers:” but the truth is, that they are required to be faithful Stewards of property, which is indeed committed to their charge, but which neither they nor any one living can possibly inherit. The pretence of *inheriting* property which is vested in Trust for certain *purposes*, is by its absurdity its own refutation: but men who are drowning catch even at straws. Thus the Modern English Unitarians style themselves “The genuine Representatives of the English Presbyterians,” than which nothing

\* See p. x.

can be more puerile or contrary to Fact ; for, even if we could possibly admit the monstrous principle which they would impose upon us, viz *That supposing them to be the descendants of the original founders and contributors, they would thereby be entitled to dispose of the Property as they may now see fit*—yet that admission would avail them nothing. The pretext of their being those descendants, is altogether untenable and false. Let it be granted that the posterity of those who devote their property by Trust deeds to certain purposes, have a right to dispose of that property for purposes directly opposed to the intentions of their progenitors and the stipulations of the Trust deeds which alone can empower them to dispose of that property ; (for these Trustees claim a right in direct opposition to the very legal instruments to which they refer as actually giving them their title) and even this large and unbounded allowance will fail to serve the purpose of the Unitarians.

“An ancestor of my own” says Mr. Samuel Kay “was one of the original founders of Cross Street Chapel” Manchester. If all who like Mr. Kay can shew their pedigree, were assembled, we should find, instead of *the descendants of the founders*, only an insignificant minority, a minute fractional portion, the addition or abstraction of which, would be alike unperceived. The congregation now worshipping in Cross Street Chapel, is according to Mr. G. W. Wood, “virtually the same that worshipped there when its walls were fresh from the hand of the builder.”

What Mr. Wood particularly means by “*virtually the same*” does not appear: but if the curious in this inquiry were to enter Cross Street Chapel, one of the largest and most numerous attended of all the places of worship now in Unitarian occupation, they would find there—Emigrants from the continent of Europe, both Jews and Gentiles—Strangers from the Northern division of our Island—and others who were attracted by the eloquence of the late Dr. Barnes, whose memory receives such scanty indulgence from Mr. Richard Potter;—but there would be little to reward their straining eyesight in searching after “*descendants of the original founders.*” The descendants of the old English Presbyterians and Independents, are nowhere so scarce, as in Unitarian Chapels, or on the lists of benefactory funds administered by Unitarian Trustees.

The almost incalculable majority of the descendants of those who contributed to the erection of those chapels, and of the congregations who first worshipped within their walls, are now chiefly among the Orthodox Dissenters. Among them their forefathers found an asylum, when expelled by those who though few in number, were unhappily great in power, and who drove out “the genuine representatives of the English Presbyterians” by a remorseless intrusion of the Socinian doctrines;—and while a few descendants of original Trustees (who are Trustees also themselves) may yet attend the ancient Chapels, they who are allied by religious sentiments as well as by consanguinity, to the Founders, are no longer there.

It is only with respect to Chapels, that this subterfuge deserves a moment's notice; for surely, Samuel Shore,\* Esq. of Meersbrook, and The

\* The occurrence of this Gentleman's name, gives the opportunity of introducing the following interesting documents relative to the originally orthodox chapel at Stannington (see Appendix, p. 173.) with which the Editors have been furnished by a highly respectable correspondent at Sheffield. It appears that the Manchester Controversy, had given an impulse to the friends of truth and justice in the large and populous town of Sheffield and its neighbourhood; and as the case of Stannington Chapel is one of most flagrant perversion, and Mr. Shore the acting Trustee enjoys a high reputation for uprightness and benevolence, it was resolved to memorialize that gentleman on the important subject, in order that an appeal to his justice, might supersede the necessity of resorting to any other means of recovering the Chapel to its legitimate uses. From the manner in which Mr. Shore received the Deputation, and from the evident effect produced upon him by the conversation, and by the reading of the memorial, the parties aggrieved were not without hope of success. This hope however Mr. Shore, having conferred with his colleagues, saw fit to disappoint. The following are—The MEMORIAL which was presented to Mr. Shore on behalf of the inhabitants of Stannington who are prevented from attending at the Chapel by the doctrines which are preached there; and the accompanying LETTER—Mr. Shore's ANSWER—and the REPLY of the Deputation.

To SAMUEL SHORE, Esq. of Meersbrook, in the Parish of Norton, in the County of Derby, the Trustee or Guardian of Stannington Chapel and its Endowments, and to any other Trustee or Trustees of the same, The Petition of the inhabitants, Householdors, and others, of the Township of Stannington, in the Chapelry of Bradfield, and Parish of Ecclesfield. respectfully

SHEWETH :

1st. That one Richard Spoone, of Stannington, by his will, dated the 20th day of May, 1652, among other charitable bequests, devised certain lands, and other property. “ for and to-

Rev. T. Belsham, with their colleagues, will not pretend to have succeeded by heirship to the property of Dr. Daniel Williams and Lady Hewley.

wards the maintenance of such a preaching minister, in the Township aforesaid, as three of the next neighbouring Ministers to the said town, or the Testator's Feoffees, or the greater part of them, should approve of for honesty of life, soundness in doctrine, and diligence in preaching." And what the Testator himself understood by the phrase "soundness in doctrine" is apparent, from the following words in the preamble to his will. "*I desire, in the name of Jesus Christ, to bequeath my soul into the hands of God that gave it, hoping assuredly TO BE SAVED BY THE DEATH AND PRECIOUS BLOOD-SHEDDING OF JESUS CHRIST MY REDEEMER, AND BY NO OTHER MERITS.*"

2d. That from a record in the Herald's College, it appears that Richard Spooone established a place of worship at Stannington, about the year 1652 or 1653--and from other evidence, that the said place of worship was designed for an Episcopalian Chapel, being built in the form, and fitted up in the manner usually adopted in such erections, and that thirteen Episcopalian Ministers, in regular succession, performed Divine Service in the said Chapel, agreeably to the rites and ceremonies contained in the Book of Common Prayer, and that, although the said place of worship and its Endowments afterwards passed into the hands of Orthodox Dissenters, through the influence of an opulent individual long since deceased; yet the discipline of the Established Church was more or less maintained, and part of its services regularly performed, until the Chapel became unfit for the purpose of public worship, which happened about the year 1740. And it further appears, that, during the period the Chapel was under the management of the Dissenters, Mr. Thomas Marriott, of Ughill, gave additional lands towards the maintenance of a minister at Stannington.

3d. That, so soon as Spooone's Chapel became completely dilapidated, one Thomas Marriott, an orthodox dissenter, and nephew of the former Marriott, purchased a small plot of ground immediately adjoining Spooone's land, and, with the aid of a few friends, caused a new chapel to be erected thereon, to be used in



Let it be supposed that certain Trustees who are appointed to act for the benefit of an orphan family, eject the true heirs from their lawful pos-

the propagation of that form of orthodox dissent, usually known by the term Independent, or Calvinist. And further that the said Thomas Marriott appointed Mr. Smith (a preacher of this denomination,) the first minister of the said chapel, who held the office of pastor about twenty years. It is also found, that this gentleman was succeeded by a Mr. Hall, a native of the district, who at that time resided in the immediate neighbourhood, and although he professed himself a Trinitarian when he was appointed, yet he afterwards became an Arian, and, after preaching about nineteen years, having disgraced himself, he departed to Rotterdam. After his departure, Mr. Rhodes, a Calvinist Divine, was appointed by the major part of the inhabitants, with your concurrence, in the year 1780, and he continued pastor of a very numerous congregation till the year 1785, when he removed to Sutton, in Warwickshire.

4th. That after Mr. Rhodes's removal, two gentlemen, understood at that time to be Trustees, appointed Mr. Gibson, an Arian or Unitarian Minister, contrary to the earnest and respectful solicitations of nearly the whole congregation, who desired to have an orthodox pastor. When their request was denied, most of them left the chapel, some of them began to frequent the Church at Bradfield, others that at Ecclesfield, and the rest left the neighbourhood, and became members of the Independent congregation in Queen-street, of whom some are alive at this day. It further appears, that ever since Mr. Gibson's appointment, which occasioned such a general dispersion of the congregation, the chapel has been served by Unitarian Ministers, who, during the labours of forty years, have scarcely made a score proselytes. And, even at this very time, the congregation consists of about thirty or forty individuals, with a chapel capable of containing about 400 or 500 persons, in a district, the population whereof is near 2,000 souls, who have no other accommodation for public worship within a considerable distance, except a small Wesleyan Chapel, erected in 1821.

5th. That in direct opposition to the well known wishes and

sessions, and those heirs with their posterity, either decline into poverty, or acquire fortunes elsewhere—and that those Trustees enjoy the undisturbed

intentions of those who founded Stannington Chapel, we, the inhabitants, are precluded from the privilege of public worship in a place built expressly for our accommodation, by the appointment of a Minister who teaches doctrines contrary to the honest convictions of our consciences, and such as were never contemplated by those who gave the lands and other property, for the maintenance and support of a minister.

6th. That we are advised, that by the law of the land, neither the Trustees, nor the majority of a congregation have any power to apply trust-property whether consisting of a chapel or endowments, to the maintenance of doctrines contrary to those for which the property was set apart by the founders. The following opinion has been given by the Lord Chancellor, viz. “ If the institution was established for the express purpose of such form of religious worship, or the teaching of such particular doctrines, as the founder has thought most conformable to the principles of the Christian religion, I do not apprehend that it is in the power of individuals having the management of that institution, at any time to alter the purpose for which it was founded, or to say to the remaining members, ‘ We have changed our opinions, and you, who assemble in this place for the purpose of hearing the doctrines, and joining in the worship prescribed by the Founder, shall no longer enjoy the benefit he intended for you, unless you conform to the alteration which has taken place in our opinions.’ ”

We confidently submit, that nothing can be more explicit than the directions contained in Mr. Spooner’s Will, or more certain than the well known religious sentiments of Mr. Marriott, or more evident than that the appropriation of the chapel and endowments to the maintenance of Unitarian doctrines, which are taught by the present minister, is illegal and unjust, and contrary to the wishes of a very great majority of the inhabitants.

We, therefore, the inhabitants of Stannington aforesaid, respectfully solicit your attention to the preceding statements. We are inclined to believe you have hitherto been a stranger to the

possession of the property thus acquired, during their own lives, and then are succeeded by their children, who likewise bequeath it to theirs, and so on:

more important facts of the case: we cannot for a moment suppose you would *wilfully* counteract the designs of the pious dead, or violate a sacred trust; we will not entertain the idea that you could *knowingly* alienate our rights and privileges; nor do we imagine that you can sanction the perversion or misapplication of trust property. On these grounds, therefore, we confidently make our appeal to you, and earnestly entreat that the chapel, lands, &c. may be restored to their right owners, and applied to the purposes for which they were intended. We beseech you, then, by your love of truth, by your regard for law, justice, and equity, by the high character you sustain, by all that is dear to you as a man, a parent, and a Christian, listen to our reasonable requests; and since your authority was made available for the appointment of the present Minister, let it be successfully exerted for his removal. We respect your aged person, we venerate your hoary hairs, and would not that any thing should embitter the closing scene of your life: we would rather your last days should be your best days, that your sun should set in splendour, and your memory be blessed.

N. B. The persons whose names are inserted under the head "Unitarians" are understood as expressing their wish for the continuance of the present minister, and as objecting to this petition."

---

*Copy of a Letter which accompanied the Memorial to  
S. Shore, Esq.*

Sir,—It may be necessary to accompany the petition now produced, from the inhabitants of Stannington, with a few explanatory remarks.

It will be observed, that the columns for signatures are divided into two classes—the one headed Trinitarian, and the other Unitarian. We believe application for names has been made in

—but at length the public attention being excited, the descendants of those Trustees are required to administer righteously the Trusts to which they are appointed. If the actual Trustees were then to claim this property as theirs by descent, and say,

every family within the prescribed limits; and those who approve of the prayer of the petition have signed under the title *Trinitarian*, while those who wish the present minister to remain have subscribed their names under the title *Unitarian*. Every signature, whether for or against the petition, is the voluntary act of each individual respectively: no undue influence, threat, persuasion, or intimidation has been resorted to, for the purpose of procuring names. The Chapel may be considered as the centre of the district throughout which the canvass has been made, and it has not been extended beyond a mile in any direction, except in that towards Bradfield: in this latter direction, the canvass has been carried half way between the Chapel and Bradfield Church, which are four miles asunder. According to the best information that can be obtained, we find, that, within the limits of the canvass, there are about 390 persons twenty-one years old and upwards, and these were all considered eligible to sign the petition. Of this number, 340 have signed in favour of the petition, 27 have signed against, and about 15 have expressed a wish to remain neutral; their reasons for adopting this course can be given by the parties who made the canvass, if required.

It may be proper to add, that many houses, situated in the more remote parts of the district, known by the name of Stanington, (and so designated by the collector of the King's taxes,) are beyond the limits prescribed to those who were employed to collect signatures. It was thought more advisable to take the opinions of those persons who are most interested in the business, as being residents in the immediate neighbourhood of the Chapel, and subject to the greatest inconvenience, provided they are not satisfied with the present order of things. The result of the canvass, which has been conducted in the most honourable and impartial manner, shews clearly what sort of feeling prevails amongst the inhabitants: and those of them who have managed the business are quite anxious that their conduct should undergo

“ Would you deprive us of that which we *inherit from our fathers?*” “ You declare *war* against us, you are *robbers*, and wish to enrich yourselves

the strictest scrutiny, being confident, that your approbation of what they have done will rise in proportion as you become more and more intimately acquainted with the *manner* in which it has been done.

To Samuel Shore, Esq. Meersbrook.

April 26, 1825.

---

*Mr. Shore's Answer to the Memorial and Letter.*

Meersbrook, May 9th, 1825.

Mr. James Wilson, Solicitor, Sheffield.

Sir,—As an answer was desired to the Papers left with me, when you lately called here, with a number of the inhabitants of Staunington. If the object of the application be for the dismissal of the Rev. Mr. Wright, whose character was admitted to be a good one, and to obtain the disposal and possession of the Chapel at Staunington with its endowments. I have to inform you, that the other Trustees agree with me that it would be acting contrary to our duty to give any countenance to those propositions, and I am,

Sir, your most obedient Servant,

SAMUEL SHORE.

---

*The Reply of the Deputation to Mr. Shore's Letter.*

TO SAMUEL SHORE, ESQ.

Staunington, May 21, 1825.

Sir,—We, the deputation who waited upon you on the 27th of April last, with a memorial from the inhabitants of Staunington have to acknowledge the receipt of your answer. We have also to express the surprise of the inhabitants that you should entertain any doubt respecting the object of their petition. Permit us, therefore, to say, that their sole aim is to have the Chapel and

with our *spoils* :”—would it not be perfectly reasonable in reply to these exclamations, to say, “No man can give what he does not possess ; your

its Endowments devoted to the purposes for which they were designed ; being perfectly satisfied, that the application of them to the maintenance and propagation of Unitarianism is contrary to the original intentions of the founders, at variance with the law of the land, and in opposition to the doctrinal sentiments of the inhabitants. We also respectfully submit, that the private interests of Mr. Wright, the present Minister, ought not to be put in competition with the sacred rights of the Public, more especially by the Trustees, who are bound to defend those rights from every species of violation. We add further, that the inhabitants are greatly disappointed at the result of their appeal to the Trustees, since they had the utmost reason to expect a favourable reply : at least, they entertained sanguine hopes of finding in *you* a real friend. Your high character, through a long life, had warranted the expectation that no refusal of their just rights would have obtained your sanction, particularly after the declared sentiments of the population had been so fully ascertained, and when *it is found that the advocates of Unitarianism do not amount to one thirtieth part of the number of Trinitarians. And, besides, the disparity of numbers is, in reality, much greater ; for although twenty-seven persons signed the petition in behalf of Unitarianism, it is confidently believed, that not more than five individuals have imbibed such sentiments.* With this decisive evidence of the religious opinions of the population, and possessing indubitable proofs that the Chapel was founded by men of like sentiments, and for the maintenance of Trinitarian doctrines, the petitioners consider themselves injured, in an infinite degree, by those who withhold from them their own peculiar place of public worship ; and they deem it impossible for any one to conceive, that the founders ever intended to authorize the Trustees to impose upon them such sentiments of religious doctrine as they (the Trustees) might choose to adopt, equally hostile to those which are entertained by themselves, and are still maintained by the inhabitants at large. The petitioners, therefore, cannot forbear pressing upon you and the other Trustees, the important fact,

fathers therefore could place you only in the situation which they themselves occupied—they were not Proprietors, but *Trustees*; and it is *Trusteeship* and not Property to which you have succeeded. We do not question your authority as Trustees, but call upon you to act honestly according to the Trust Deeds?" Could the Unitarians object to such reasoning as this? And yet this

that the present and future welfare of a whole district are deeply involved in the question; and that, under existing circumstances, they owe it as a duty to themselves, to their families, and to posterity, to submit the matter to their friends, and their future conduct in the business will be regulated by the advice which they shall receive.

We are, Sir, your very obedient servants,

JOHN DYSON, Churchwarden.	GEORGE THOMPSON, Jun.
GEORGE THOMPSON,	JONATHAN EARNSHAW,
WILLIAM TRICKETT,	ISAAC BRADLEY,
GEORGE EYRE,	GEORGE RONKSLEY,
JONATHAN MARSTIN,	THOMAS TRICKITT,
GEORGE PRIESTLY,	

It, therefore appears, that TO ACCOMMODATE FIVE SOCINIANS, the Trustees of Stannington chapel consider it to be THEIR DUTY TO DEPRIVE AN ENTIRE DISTRICT of the benefit of the chapel which was unquestionably built and endowed for the accommodation of the Inhabitants by Orthodox men, and for the promulgation of Orthodox doctrines!!! The Trustees tell those inhabitants in effect, "you shall either become Unitarians, and deny the doctrines on which you place your hopes of eternal salvation, or you shall not enjoy the advantages intended for you by the Founders." These are grievous terms: but it is cheering to learn that, after fifty years perversion of this property to Unitarian purposes, there are only five Unitarians in this village, and that the rest of the inhabitants maintain a steadfast adherence to the truth. On the authority of the Chancellor's judgment above referred to, and which is peculiarly applicable to this case, we may safely pronounce the CONDUCT OF THESE TRUSTEES TO BE AS ILLEGAL AS IT IS UNJUST.

is exactly the case, with the present Trustees of the property which was devoted to religious purposes by the Orthodox of former days. If all these Trustees were able to trace their descent from *the original Trustees*, yet they cannot possibly be the *Owners* of the property so devoted and put in Trust for special purposes. No one wishes to interfere with their title to administer these funds as *Trustees*: but when they describe themselves as the *Heirs*, they assume a name and usurp a right to which they have no equitable or reasonable claim.

But if it were even admitted in opposition to reason and to fact, that they are the heirs of the contributors to these erections and the founders of these endowments, would they therefore have the right to divert that property from its original purpose and design, and without blame or responsibility, to employ it in such a way as might seem best to themselves? Is this the Nature and Tenure of Trust property? Are Trust Deeds merely soiled parchment, and are Trustees, as such, the possessors of an unentailed and unrestricted Freehold? If Trustees are not amenable to Trust Deeds, but Trust Deeds are to be subservient to Trustees, why incur the expence, why practise the imposture of preparing Trust Deeds at all? Is the public mind prepared to admit, that it is in vain for persons who bequeath property to religious or charitable uses, to specify the purposes and design of their endowment?—that the sanction of the Law, is insufficient to secure the validity of a legal instrument? Do the Unitarians themselves recognize this disorganizing, this chaotic principle, in the few



Chapels which they erect? Do they, when providing for the appropriation of the funds which they so employ, act as if there were neither meaning nor validity in a Trust Deed?

If the original proprietors had the right to devote and set apart this property, in the terms employed, and for the purposes described, in the Trust Deeds, it is impossible in the nature of things, for any persons, whether lineally descended or otherwise, to have an opposite right. In that case, the second right would annihilate the first; and to justify the principle which the Unitarians would fain establish, two absolute contraries must be equally true. But if it be legal, honest, and righteous to *make* a Trust Deed, it cannot be legal, honest, and righteous to *break* a Trust Deed; nor will any pretence whatever short of legal or physical impossibility, justify a departure either from its spirit or letter.

As the Deed which gives to one man a Title to an Estate, cannot possibly give to another man a right to take it from him: so the Deeds which devote property to *certain purposes*, cannot possibly authorize or permit the employment of that property for *contrary purposes*. To say, as the Unitarians do, (Monthly Repos. March, 1825, p. 158.) That when it is “INEXPEDIENT”\* to fulfil exactly the intentions of the founders, the Trustees have a right “to consider what might *probably* have been the views of the founders under the

\* Their phrase is “impracticable or inexpedient:” they know it is *not* impracticable; but no one is surprised that they deem it *inexpedient*.

*new circumstances* which may have arisen, and what *upon the whole* is best to be done," is to teach a doctrine, which, if it prevailed, would reduce mankind to a state of lawless barbarism, without recorded rights, and without a standard of justice. It would destroy all social confidence, and render our Tribunals and judicial proceedings a solemn mockery.\*

\* The pious and learned Dr. J. Pye Smith, has in a Letter to the Editor of the Monthly Repository for April, 1825, with his usual clearness and force, laid down the following undeniable maxims on this subject; viz.

I. As all sound writers on morals maintain that oaths are to be understood according to the mind of the imposer, so all other promissory engagements are to be understood, undertaken, and fulfilled according to the mind of the requirer.

II. Trusteeships, whether created by deeds of gift, or by wills, are a species of promissory engagements.

III. Trustees are bound to fulfil the *known* intentions of founders or testators, faithfully and strictly, unless they be immoral, in which case the engagement is void from the beginning; or have become, from change of circumstances, physically impossible.

IV. If, in any case, such an impossibility have accrued, it is the duty of trustees to *approximate* as closely as possible to the known intention of the trust.

Your correspondent truly states that "the intentions of the pious and benevolent founders of institutions cannot be always exactly fulfilled:" and he therefore conceives, "that trustees who hold property of this kind have a right, when the exact fulfilment of the intentions of the founders is *impracticable* or *inexpedient*, to consider what might probably have been the views of the founders under the new circumstances which may have arisen, and what upon the whole is best to be done." Readily granted, when the exact compliance can be truly and honestly said to be *impracticable*: yet surely, in such case, reason and justice say, approach to it as nearly as you can. But I cannot concede that trustees have a right to set up what they may deem *expedient*, and substitute that for the intention of their trust. Is it not

From the moment in which this property was set apart to the *purposes* specified, it ceased to belong to, or to be at the discretionary disposal of, any *persons*. The Original Trustees were appointed to fulfil those *purposes* and *those purposes only*; they had no other power over the property, nor can their successors have more than they possessed. If therefore the trustees fail at any time to fulfil, and more especially if they contravene and destroy, the purposes of their Trust, they commit a most aggravated injustice against those who are no longer living to vindicate their rights, and have an awful account to render unto God, who will bring into judgment every secret thing, and who will severely punish an injustice which is more inexcusable than even removing "a neighbour's land mark."

Nothing could extenuate this conduct on the part of any persons; but in these pretenders to lineal descent, it has a guilt equivalent to that of intentional parricide. They inflict a deadly wound where alone those whom they call their progenitors are now vulnerable, and do that which were they still living, would bring their "grey hairs with sorrow to the grave." When those pious per-

most evident that *this is a principle subversive of all truth and fidelity?* Was there ever an act of *injustice, fraud, or plunder* perpetrated which did not appear to the doer of it *highly expedient?*

With respect to calculations upon "what *might probably have been* the views of the founders, under new circumstances," I can scarcely conceive of any principle of conduct more *precarious*, more *hazardous*, or more *flexible to inclination and interest.*"

sons so carefully prepared their Deeds, and placed such confidence in individual integrity and the inviolability of legal documents, they little thought that these very endowments would be employed for the purpose of destroying the Cause which was most dear to them; and that thus, while designing blessings, they were through unanticipated perversions, preparing curses for the Church. How would their righteous souls have been grieved, could they have foreseen, that they who now deny the Deity and Atonement of Christ, and vilify "the faith once delivered to the saints," would employ for those purposes, the *Chapels*, the *Funds*, and even the very NAME, which once were theirs! If any thing could impair the happiness of "the spirits of just men made perfect," it must be such scenes as these. Thus the pretence of heirship, even if it were not groundless, so far from excusing these misappropriations, would aggravate the injustice by giving to it a new and more enormous character.

Were the deviation from the intentions of the founders only slight, and were the original objects and purposes, though with some variation of sentiment and in an inferior degree, still pursued, it would yet be the duty of the Trustees to return to a strict and rigid observance of the Trust Deeds. No departure whatever can be justified, nor can any Deed provide for even the smallest relaxation of its own requirements. In common life every Trustee of honourable mind or of honest feeling, is jealous for the testimony of his own conscience and of his fellow citizens, that

not one jot or tittle of the Deed, is opposed or evaded; and is it in religious affairs alone, that a violation of this rule is to be allowed? The abuses of *Charitable Endowments* are denominated usurpation and fraud—by what terms are we to describe the abuses of *Religious Endowments*?

Yet if no very material alteration had taken place, though the duty of the Trustees would remain the same, it might be doubted whether the public agitation of the question would be necessary or wise. The remedy of the evil if not very malignant, might have been left to the consciences of the Trustees themselves; and the Public might have been content to wait the slow process of internal reformation. It is far however from being thus.

The Editors of the Monthly Repository (No. 229) say concerning the body which they represent, “it is alleged they *do not believe all that their fathers believed:*” but the allegation is that they *deny all that was believed* by those whom they call their fathers. The contrariety of sentiment is as great as possible;—it amounts to actual antipathy, and nothing will satisfy the Unitarians but “*uprooting the belief*” of all that which the founders planted and watered with such affectionate assiduity and care. Socinianism is a system which can exist and flourish only by the extinction of Orthodoxy. This diametrical opposition has been clearly evinced by the Unitarians themselves, who boast of differing more from Orthodox Christians than Protestants do from

Papists. In truth, every doctrine which was held by the founders, is by the present occupants of their Chapels and Beneficiaries of their funds, either *denied*, or held in so different respects as to be *equivalent to a denial*. Can any thing be more contradictory to the sentiments of the Founders, than the opinions of the Unitarians concerning the DIVINE EXISTENCE—THE INSPIRATION OF THE SCRIPTURES—the PERSON and WORK OF CHRIST—the HOLY SPIRIT—the NATURE OF CHRISTIANITY—the STATE of the DEPARTED—and the FUTURE LIFE? And besides these fundamental points, what remains in which they can either differ or agree? Thus it is evident, that the design of the authors of these Funds and Endowments could not be more completely frustrated, and that a stronger case of the necessity of investigation and correction could not possibly occur.'

There is no distinctive appellation, in which the gentlemen whose administration of the funds for religious uses which have fallen into their hands is now in question, usually so much delight, as in the term UNITARIAN. They are Unitarians *par excellence*, and their religion is Unitarian Christianity. At the Harris dinner, we hear only of Unitarianism, and Mr. Grundy received a "Noble Present" for his zeal in the Cause of *Unitarian Christianity*. When they build a Chapel it is "the Unitarian Chapel at such a place;" their "Book Societies," their "Missionary Societies," their "Associations," their "Funds" *when they raise any*, are all UNITARIAN. But this is only

during a state of repose. "Presbyterian" is their *nom de guerre*. When the important subject of Trusts and Trust Deeds is agitated, when they are reasoned with "of righteousness and judgment to come," all at once they are Presbyterians and Presbyterians only. "The Founders," say they, "were Presbyterians and so are we." This is the "flattering unction" they would apply to their own consciences; this is the flimsy screen they would interpose to ward off inquiry. Thus in the following Correspondence, the Gentleman who in attempting an apology for the Dinner proceedings, signs himself "An Unitarian Christian," when he has to reply to "Another Orthodox Dissenter" on the trying point of Funds and Endowments, finds it convenient to change his name to "An English Presbyterian;" and Mr. Samuel Kay his coadjutor is also a Presbyterian, for no other denomination is recited in the Deeds of Cross-Street Chapel. If they could even beguile us into the belief that they are actually and *bonâ fide* Presbyterians, that imposition upon our understanding would avail them nothing; for the Founders of these Chapels and Endowments, thought *very little indeed* of the difference between Presbyterianism and Independency, but they thought *every thing* of the opposition between their own doctrinal sentiments and those of the Socinians. Of so little moment was the distinction of discipline deemed, that it was not uncommon for the same Chapels to receive contributions from the funds of both Denominations. This was the case at Needham Market, previously to Dr. Priestley's settling there,

although the Doctor for obvious reasons, declined receiving for himself any assistance from the Independents. These gentlemen are therefore taking unnecessary pains ; for it is impossible to raise to importance the mere point of *church government* ; while the *doctrinal sentiment* is ALL IN ALL.\*

\* "The differences between the Presbyterians and the Congregationalists or Independents at the time when the trusts referred to were created, (a period which may be taken as from about 1670 to 1720,) *were not* " considered matters of consequence by our ancestors," *in comparison with* the differences of religious sentiment between both those denominations on the one side, and, on the other, the persons in their day, who held opinions resembling or approaching to those of the Unitarians of the present time.

The proof of this assertion is obvious to all who are acquainted with the history and the writings of the English Presbyterian Divines in the period referred to. I would refer "your correspondent" to paragraphs without end, and to whole treatises, in the works of the most distinguished Presbyterian fathers of the Dissenting interest ; in particular, Mr. Baxter, Mr. Howe, Dr. Bates, Dr. Daniel Williams, and Dr. Calamy. He will, perhaps, be surprised in reading the mere title of a quarto pamphlet which is lying before me : "The Excellency of Unity ; being a Sermon preached by the appointment of the Ministers of the Congregational and Presbyterian persuasion, at their HAPPY UNION ; on April 6, 1691, which was a day set apart by them, partly to bewail former divisions, and partly as a thanksgiving to God for their *present agreement* ; and now, at their unanimous request, made public by Matthew Mead, Pastor of a Church of Christ at Stepney." The theme of this sermon is rejoicing and gratitude on account of the visible and declared union in a public association, of those who possessed already a "*Oneness*—in the inward principles and outward practice of religion,—as joint members of Christ and one of another ;" (acknowledging) "*one Spirit* to enlighten and teach, to sanctify, to direct and lead ; *one Lord*, and that is the Lord Jesus Christ, whom we all worship and serve ; *one faith*, one system of Christian doctrine."



If they could succeed in proving themselves to be Presbyterians, they would gain nothing; if they fail, as fail they must, they are but where they

“Allow me to quote also a passage from Dr. Calamy, who was among the most zealous maintainers of the Presbyterian plan of discipline. It is from his, “Letter to a Divine in Germany, giving a brief but true account of the Protestant Dissenters in England.” London 1717. “There are some things in which they differ among themselves. For some of them are most desirous of the Presbyterian form of church government, as it is legally established in North Britain. Others are rather for the Congregational form of government, by each worshipping assembly within itself; having no other reference to classes or synods than for advice in cases of need. But, notwithstanding these and some other such differences among themselves, they generally agree in the doctrinal articles of the Church of England, the Confession of Faith, and Larger and Smaller Catechisms compiled by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster.” (P. 44.)

From such evidences as these, I conclude that the difference on Church Government between the Presbyterians and Congregationalists at the beginning of the eighteenth century, would have been deemed by each of the parties lighter than the dust of the balance, in comparison with those doctrinal views in which they cordially agreed, and which they equally held to be of vital and eternal moment. The former difference was no bar to ministerial and ecclesiastical communion, or to a public and affectionate co-operation: but from any who had differed from them as completely as the modern Unitarians do, the old Presbyterians would unquestionably have maintained the most complete separation. To every man who is acquainted with their character and writings, it is impossible for a doubt to exist, whether they would not have shrunk with the deepest horror from the idea of permitting their names, their property, or their influence, to go for the support of a system of doctrine which was subversive of all their own faith and labours, and which they conscientiously believed to be utterly ruinous to the everlasting welfare of mankind. Surely, Sir, your correspondent stated the case without due reflection,

were. In truth, they are no more *Presbyterians* in government, than they are *Orthodox* in doctrine; and the attempt to disprove their claim to that ecclesiastical denomination, would be an insult to the understanding of every man who is at all acquainted with the characteristics of the different forms of discipline.

Subsequently to the Restoration, Presbyterianism was not systematized in England, as it was in Scotland and in the foreign Reformed Churches: for although Synodical conventions were attempted in some parts of this country, yet those associations were purely voluntary and not permanent.\* Although the government in those churches was not strictly speaking congregational, yet their different places of worship had a separate management, and were to a great degree, independent of each other. They were called indeed Presbyterians, but that was chiefly because they were not Independents,

when he wrote, "We differ somewhat from our forefathers on matters of doctrine and of discipline." Who, in reading this clause, would imagine that the diminishing word "*somewhat*," represents a consideration *beyond expression great*, a distance and opposition so wide that, in comparison with it, the dissent itself, and all the imaginable varieties of order, discipline, and rituals, sink into nothing?"—Dr. J. Pye Smith's Letter to the Editor of the Monthly Repository, April 11, 1825.

\* The nearest approach to *strict Presbyterianism* was made in Lancashire and Cheshire; (see Mr. Slate's Letter, p. 95.) but even there it did not continue very long. There is also no doubt, that many of the places of worship which now go under the common name of "Presbyterian Chapels," were built, endowed, and originally occupied, by Congregationalists.

and no other name at that time occurred. Unhappily too much power vested in the Trustees, who by the possession both of the Funds and the *Deeds*, were rendered almost irresponsible. Had these churches been *Independent*, the *people* would have had an imperative voice; had they been really *Presbyterian*, there would have been a controlling power in the *Presbytery* and *Synod*, by which means the purity of doctrine has been so well preserved in the Scottish Churches: but in propriety of speech, they were neither entirely Presbyterian, nor entirely Independent, and therefore there was no practical responsibility or supervision. The original Trustees were indeed pious and Orthodox men, and as long as they survived, the evil was postponed: but they were succeeded by others of a different character, yet of equal power. These Trustees, regardless of the Trust Deeds, appointed to the ministry whom they chose; and they chose to appoint preachers, first of Arian, and then of Socinian sentiments. The Congregations, who had no authority by their ecclesiastical constitution, and who despaired of a successful appeal to the Trust Deeds, withdrew from these erroneous preachers, and either dispersed among other churches which retained their Orthodoxy, or formed new ones, in which the voice of the people was scripturally regarded. Thus the Chapels with their endowments, fell into the hands of the present occupants, who *are* Socinians in doctrine, and who *are not* Presbyterians in discipline.\*

\* "The modern Unitarian congregations are not really Presby-

Ecclesiastical corruptions whether of doctrine or of liturgy, have usually originated with the Clergy; nor does the present case furnish an exception. During the reigns of Charles II. and his brother, the dread of Popery and the operation of penal laws, tended to preserve the pureness of the word and doctrine in the Dissenting Churches: but when the apprehension of Popish ascendancy was removed by the Act of Settlement, and when the fear of a general persecution was allayed by the Act of Toleration, the calm and tranquillity which followed, were characterized by a state of torpor more than equivalent to the previous excitement; and such a state is always favourable to the insinuation and progress of error.

When the Dissenting Ministers were no longer liable to fines, imprisonment, and death, for preaching the Gospel, there were many persons, who from the most unsuitable motives, solicited and obtained the ministerial office, and who feeling no attachment to the doctrines of Christianity, re-

terian, and they are so designated only by a customary but improper application of the term.

Are they not as completely Congregational and Independent as we are? Do they constitute ruling elders in each congregation, to act in conjunction with their pastors, for judging of the qualifications of communicants and other acts of discipline? Have they courts of review? Have they classical, provincial, and synodical assemblies? Do they even, in general, maintain any kind of church discipline whatever? How then can they, upon any principle of truth and fairness, call themselves by an appellation which has not the semblance of propriety? In point of fact, they are as little entitled to be considered as the successors and representatives of the old Presbyterians, in relation to ecclesiastical order, as they are with respect to the most important principles of Doctrine."—Dr. J. Pyc Smith, as before.

frained always from enforcing, and often from introducing them in their sermons; and thus, being at first indifferent, they soon became latitudinarian, and then altogether erroneous. The unsuspecting indulgence of some who were truly Orthodox, gave an unhappy facility to this introduction of error, while many of the children of the old Dissenters began to sympathize with their contemporary preachers and thus the Churches gradually assumed a mixed character, without either party acknowledging a necessity of separation. Young men who had been destined to the ministry in early life, and had actually entered upon that office without experiencing a change of heart, fostered the growing evil; and the Orthodox and Heterodox continued to preach in one pulpit, and to commune at one Table. Thus did unconverted Ministers, introduce those anti-christian doctrines, which were not resisted with sufficient zeal even by the truly pious of those days, and which proved so palatable to unconverted Trustees, as to induce them to embrace every opportunity of appointing such ministers to the vacant pulpits of the Orthodox. It was in the form of Arianism however, that error first crept in. Socinianism broadly and distinctly avowed, could not then have gained admission: but Arianism by preserving many of the modes of Orthodox expression and behaviour, was less shocking to the minds of the pious, and more seductive to the hearts of the unstable; and thus Orthodox ministers, were willing to accept of colleagues who held the Arian scheme, and Orthodox church members, regarded their Arian fellow communicants as Christian brethren.

Had this treacherous calm remained undisturbed, —could it have been contrived by continuing to lull the suspicions of the Orthodox, to perpetuate this incongruous association, this connexion of the living with the dead,—there is reason to fear that the whole body would have been paralysed beyond recovery: but the premature explosion of Arianism at Exeter, was overruled to prevent what otherwise might have been, the silent, unexpected and total extinction of piety in those churches. Then the Orthodox were roused to a salutary alarm, and began to perceive the folly of their previous indulgence of false doctrine. For a season the progress of error was suspended: but it had gone too far to be repressed by that discountenance which it received too late. The Churches which the Orthodox were constrained to abandon, being thus free from all restraint, soon passed from Arianism to Socinianism, and became what we now behold them, the sepulchres of evangelical Truth.\*

\* A writer in the “Monthly Repository for March 1825” has betrayed the weakness and poverty of the Socinian Cause, by attempting to fetch an excuse for this *malversation of Trusts*, from the Period of the Reformation from Popery in England—from the fact that some of the early Christians employed heathen temples for Christian worship—and ‘*risum teneatis*,’ from the Apostles having preached Christianity in Jewish synagogues! He then with stolid gravity, enquires concerning Dr. J. Pye Smith, “What *will* the learned Doctor say to this?” The Editors are so satisfied with what that *truly* ‘learned Doctor’ *does* say, that they give *his reply*, instead of any remarks of *their own*: viz.

“Your correspondent thinks that he presses me hard by appealing to facts in the first introduction of Christianity, and at the Reformation. I feel no weight whatever in the argument which he deduces from them. The Apostles never claimed a *pro-*

The days which preceded this separation, were the best days of those who have thus departed from the right way. While the Orthodox, either

*perty* in the synagogues in which, according to undisputed usage, they were admitted to preach the doctrine of Jesus; and Christianity was not a rival system to the Mosaic dispensation, but was its completion and perfection. The ancient heathen temples were *the property of the state*, and the use of them was directed by no assignments of trust. As little relevant do the confiscation and new application of Roman Catholic foundations, at the time of the Reformation, appear to me. Great injustice and cruelty were exercised by Henry VIII. and other persons, while they were throwing off a yoke of iniquity and oppression: but these were *acts of the legislature*, and might have been conducted with equity and liberality. Yet in either vindicating or condemning the conduct of the states which, at that time, burst the fetters which ignorance, fraud, and force had forged, there are numerous and complicated considerations to be taken into the account. If your correspondent is not aware of them, I beg to refer him to Burnet's History of the Reformation: or, for a sketch of them, to the introductory part of Schiller's History of the Thirty Years' War.

But all these facts, in the origin and the constitution of *secular church establishments*, are remote from the case under consideration, and can serve only to obscure a plain question. Is not a trust perverted, if it is administered knowingly and designedly in contradiction to the intention of the person who created the trust; when there is no interference of legislative authority, nor any impracticableness or even difficulty in the faithful observance of that intention? In the instances referred to, I conceive that the chief criminality lay with those trustees who, eighty or ninety years ago, began the system of violating their obvious duty: but I must confess myself unable to perceive that their successors down to the present time, though not equally chargeable with the blame, are free from *the guilt of participation*. I must, however, profess my conviction that, if any Unitarian were to intrust to me his property, for the endowment of academical institutions or places of religious worship, and I had the same kind and degree of evidence of his will and intention as exist in the cases

from ignorance of their true character, or from too great indulgence for their erroneous sentiments, continued them in their fellowship, they derived from that association respectability and weight; until at length they found themselves strong enough to reject the patronage which they had courted, and even to expel those who had cherished them in their weakness. But when they were detected, disowned, and abandoned by the Orthodox, their system began to wither and decay—it has continually declined, and had long ago been extinct, but for their usurpation of Orthodox funds. This question with the Unitarians is important, not because they are numerous, or because they have much influence as a body; but entirely because they withhold from the Cause of scriptural Truth, that which was designed for its advancement. The harm they have the power to inflict, is trifling; but no one can calculate the good which they have restrained. Who but must lament that this alienation was not prevented from the beginning? Then these Houses of Prayer, had not been desecrated by unscriptural sentiments and worship—then these Evangelical institutions, had not become repositories of heresy and nurseries for the advocates of error.

Yet during the existence of penal laws against those who deny the doctrine of the Trinity, it might not have been easy to render perfectly evident to

adverted to; and if I were to apply the proceeds of that property to the support of Calvinistic chapels or colleges, I should well merit a place among *those whom the Apostle declares to be unqualified to inherit the kingdom of God.*"



all, the distinction between this question and that of Religious liberty. An appeal to the laws on the ground of *malversation of a Trust*, might have been confounded with an appeal to the legal enactments *against heresy*. They who now cry out of "*war, robbery and spoliation*," would then have cried out of "*Persecution*;" and with some they might have obtained belief. The Orthodox of earlier days, wisely chose to endure this great injustice, rather than to expose themselves and their cause, to such injurious misconstructions: but now when persecution is happily impossible either to the Orthodox or the Unitarians—when, if a man were vile enough to wish to punish his neighbour for his religious opinions, it is altogether out of his power—that difficulty is no more. It is quite superfluous to disavow the *spirit* of that, the *practice* of which is impossible. Had the Orthodox of the period referred to, been equally free from the possibility of misconception, they might have preserved, or speedily recovered, these invaluable Institutions; and Socinianism would either have proved an abortion, or have expired for want of food.

This subject will be presented more clearly by the following table, which exhibits in one view the chapels which the Unitarians now occupy in England, Wales and Scotland, distinguishing the places of worship which they have themselves erected, from those which are of Orthodox foundation. This Summary is extracted from the List which forms No. I. of the Appendix, and which gives as accurate a representation of the condition of Unitarianism in these respects, at the close of the year 1824, as could possibly be obtained.

A SUMMARY of the CHAPELS occupied by UNITARIANS in ENGLAND, WALES, and SCOTLAND.

---

ENGLAND.

<i>Counties, &amp;c.</i>	<i>Orthodox foundation.</i>	<i>Unitarian foundation.</i>
BEDFORDSHIRE	0	0
BERKSHIRE	0	0
BUCKINGHAMSHIRE	0	0
CAMBRIDGESHIRE	1	0
CHESHIRE	*12	2
CORNWALL	0	0
CUMBERLAND	0	0
DERBYSHIRE	†10	4
DEVONSHIRE	11	0
DORSETSHIRE	3	0
DURHAM	1	1
ESSEX	3	1
GLOUCESTERSHIRE	4	1
HAMPSHIRE	3	1
HEREFORDSHIRE	0	0
HERTFORDSHIRE	1	0
HUNTINGDONSHIRE	0	0
KENT	8	0
LANCASHIRE	‡32	7

\* There was formerly another chapel of Orthodox foundation, but it has been converted into Cottages. See *Middlewich*, p. 123.

† Two of these chapels have been rebuilt chiefly, if not wholly by Unitarians. See *Duffield and Ashford*.

‡ One of these chapels, viz. Walton, after it fell into the hands of the Unitarians was converted into cottages. And two of the

<i>Counties, &amp;c.</i>	<i>Orthodox foundation.</i>	<i>Unitarian foundation.</i>
LEICESTERSHIRE	4	0
LINCOLNSHIRE	2	1
LONDON	3	5
MIDDLESEX	3	1
MONMOUTHSHIRE	0	0
NORFOLK	4	2
NORTHAMPTONSHIRE	0	0
NORTHUMBERLAND	2	0
NOTTINGHAMSHIRE	2	0
OXFORDSHIRE	1	0
RUTLANDSHIRE	0	0
SHROPSHIRE	3	0
SOMERSETSHIRE	7	0
STAFFORDSHIRE	7	0
SUFFOLK	5	0
SURRY	0	1
SUSSEX	5	3
WARWICKSHIRE	7	1
WESTMORELAND	1	0
WILTSHIRE	4	0
WORCESTERSHIRE	5	1
YORKSHIRE, W. R.	12	2
Do. N. & E. R.	4	2
Total in England		
	170	36

chapels in Liverpool have been built by Unitarians from funds arising chiefly, if not wholly, from the sale of the old chapels of Orthodox foundation.

## WALES.

<i>Counties</i>	<i>Orthodox foundation.</i>	<i>Unitarian foundation.</i>
CAERMARTHENSHIRE	2	1
CARDIGANSHIRE	0	3
GLAMORGANSHIRE	5	2
PEMBROKESHIRE	1	0
Total in Wales	8	6

## SCOTLAND.

EDINBURGH	0	*1
GLASGOW	0	1
PORT-GLASGOW	0	1
Total in England,	170	36
Wales,	8	6
Scotland.	0	3

The above Statement has an aspect sufficiently alarming to the friends of truth and righteousness. It appears that the Unitarians possess in this Island, TWO HUNDRED and TWENTY-THREE places of worship, of which ONE HUNDRED and SEVENTY-EIGHT, that is to say, FOUR FIFTHS of the whole were ORIGINALLY ORTHODOX. In ENGLAND alone, they

\* Besides these three chapels, the Unitarians have meeting places in Dundee and Paisley ; but these are in dwelling houses.

have TWO HUNDRED and SIX CHAPELS, of which THIRTY-SIX, or little more than ONE SIXTH PART of the whole number, were built by Unitarians. Yet the evil is not quite so aggravated as it at first appears. The Unitarian apologists, would fain have it believed, that all these places of worship though formerly orthodox, were by their respective congregations devoted to the Socinian cause, and that they now form an accumulation of strength and resources, which are as available to the dissemination of error as they once were to the propagation of truth. This, however, is not the case. It is true the Chapels have been long withdrawn, and the funds withheld, from their only legitimate purposes, and thus an amount of usefulness has been hindered, which it is impossible to describe and painful to conjecture: but Socinianism is a mere negation, it operates most lamentably to diminish the good that might otherwise have been accomplished, but it promotes no purposes of its own, it offers no substitute for that which it precludes. Its relation to the Dissenting body, is only that of a morbid excrescence or a palsied limb, which while it impairs the strength and retards the progress of the sound and healthy parts, is itself incapable of either activity or enjoyment.

The Chapels they occupy will indeed be deemed numerous—but where are the Congregations? In a few cases they are rather large; but in the vast majority of instances, it is altogether otherwise. It is more than probable that one tenth of their places of worship would contain the whole number

of attendants. It is calculated by a gentleman, who has considerable information on this subject, that in Lancashire, Cheshire, and Derbyshire, there are *forty* places of worship possessed by Unitarians, and several of them well endowed, in each of which, the average number of hearers will not amount to *twenty-five*.

In the majority of instances, the death blow was given to the congregation, when the Trustees first obtruded a Socinian ministry, and in many cases it can now scarcely be said that there are congregations in their Chapels. There is therefore, little of positive and active injury to be apprehended. Yet, while the possession of these endowments, operates in favour of Unitarianism only by delaying its fall, in the mean time these resources (which rightly directed are invaluable) are rendered worse than useless to the Cause of Christ;—and this is the evil for which a remedy is sought.

“It is high time to awake out of sleep,” and to investigate, and apply the remedy to these abuses. Socinianism has fattened long enough upon the spoils of Orthodoxy;—long enough has it desecrated those places, which were originally devoted to the worship of the TRIUNE GOD and the preaching of the GOSPEL OF CHRIST;—and long enough have those funds, which were designed by “a Mother in Israel” to relieve the necessities of poor and faithful preachers of the Word, and to assist the studies of pious young men preparatory to the ministry of the Gospel, been applied, to encrease the superfluities of those who already have more than enough, and to enable young men to learn, by

what sophisms they can best elude the force of Truth, and render Error attractive.

Should this publication contribute in any degree, to place the important subject fairly within the range of Public Opinion, and especially should it excite the attention of the parties who are most deeply injured, the Editors will have accomplished all they designed. The Cause which they advocate, is the common cause of the friends of justice and of the Religion of Christ; but especially of those Denominations of Christians, for the assistance of whose efforts these Institutions were expressly designed and legally conveyed, and upon whom Socinianism, by its misdirection of those means which were intended to supply the energies of Orthodoxy, and by the chill and desolation which it has diffused throughout the whole extent of its influence, has pressed for successive generations, as a dead weight and an incumbrance. Into their hands the matter now devolves; nor can it for one moment be supposed, that they will be either insensible to its claims, or regardless of its responsibilities.

*N. B.*—During the course of the correspondence which is contained in the following pages; three very excellent Letters appeared on the Orthodox side of the question,—one of them by the highly respected President of the Independent College, Rotherham, the Rev. James Bennett,—another by that distinguished advocate of the religion of Christ in opposition to Socinianism, the Rev. Ralph Wardlaw, D. D.—and a third by a very judicious and well informed writer who signed “A Presbyterian.” With these letters the Editors would gladly have adorned the pages of this work: but as it is considerably more voluminous than they had anticipated, and as those letters were not intended as parts of this Controversy, they feel it a duty to withhold them.



## CONTENTS.



	PAGE.
DINNER PROCEEDINGS . . . . .	1
Mr. Potter . . . . .	2, 7, 8
Rev. Mr. Grundy . . . . .	4, 7
Mr. Naylor . . . . .	6, 8
Mr. G. W. Wood . . . . .	6
Rev. J. G. Robberds . . . . .	6
Rev. Mr. Harris . . . . .	8

## CORRESPONDENCE.

An Orthodox Dissenter . . . . .	14, 23
George Harris . . . . .	17
An Unitarian Christian . . . . .	20
Another Orthodox Dissenter . . . . .	27, 32, 45
An Orthodox Observer . . . . .	33
An English Presbyterian . . . . .	37
A Nonconformist . . . . .	41
A Scotch Presbyterian . . . . .	42
George W. Wood . . . . .	53
Samuel Kay . . . . .	60, 106
John Birt . . . . .	63
George Hadfield . . . . .	72, 108
James Turner . . . . .	84
Richard Slate . . . . .	93
John Cockin . . . . .	101

APPENDIX, No. I.

	PAGE.
List of Chapels possessed by Unitarians in ENGLAND .	121
WALES .	178
SCOTLAND .	180

APPENDIX, No. II.

Manchester College, York .	182
----------------------------	-----

APPENDIX, No. III.

Dr. Williams's Charities . . .	186
--------------------------------	-----

APPENDIX, No. IV.

Lady Hewley's Charity . . .	194
-----------------------------	-----

THE  
SOCINIAN CONTROVERSY.

---

The Editors think it their duty to state, that although to prevent the unnecessary enlargement of the pamphlet, they have omitted several passages in these speeches; what they have given is extracted *verbatim* from the Manchester Gazette, and they have not intentionally omitted a syllable which has any bearing on the ensuing correspondence. Mr. Harris's speech is given at full length.

---

*From the Manchester Gazette, August 14, 1824.*

On Thursday last, a very numerous and most respectable body of gentlemen professing UNITARIAN CHRISTIANITY, gave a dinner at the Spread Eagle Inn, in honour of the Rev. JOHN GRUNDY, the Minister of Cross-street Chapel, (who is about to leave Manchester for Liverpool,) and for the purpose of presenting to him, previously to his departure, a handsome SILVER TEA SERVICE as a testimony of their high regard for the zeal he has evinced in the cause of UNITARIAN CHRISTIANITY. At four o'clock about one hundred and twenty sat down to a good, substantial dinner; RICHARD POTTER, Esq. was the President, and BENJAMIN NAYLOR, Esq. the Vice-President.—The Rev. Mr. GRUNDY sat on the right of the Chairman, and his Colleague, the Rev. J. G. ROBBERDS, at his left. Grace was impressively

said by the latter gentleman. On the cloth being removed, the Chairman announced the first toast—"The King."—Then followed, "The Land we live in; and may it be free and happy."—"Our brethren of all religious denominations."—which was received with unbounded applause.—The Chairman then rose and said, that having in the first toast done honour to the King as the first Magistrate of the land, and also to their beloved country, he would propose that which was emphatically said to be "like the air we breathe—without it we die,"—he meant—"THE LIBERTY OF THE PRESS, and may it ever be conducive to the civil and religious rights of man."—THE SERVICE OF PLATE was then introduced, amidst much applause. It bore the following inscription;—

Presented to  
THE REV. JOHN GRUNDY,  
by the Congregation  
assembling in the Chapel, Cross-street, Manchester,  
IN TESTIMONY  
of their high respect for the  
distinguished ability and manly zeal  
with which he has advocated amongst them  
the Cause of  
UNITARIAN CHRISTIANITY.  
1824.

Mr. POTTER now rose, (*much affected*,) and in presenting to the Rev. Mr. Grundy this handsome tribute, (after some expressions of personal compliment to Mr. G.) spoke as follows:—In presenting you, Sir, with this Service of Plate, it is necessary to advert to the advantages which the Cross-street Congregation have derived from your ministerial labours; and those advantages will, probably, be best understood by referring to the circumstances in which the congregation was placed at the time of your appointment.—From the death of the Rev. Mr. Seddon,\* which, I believe, took

\* For obvious reasons no allusion is made to Mr. Seddon's orthodox predecessors. Bogue and Bennett, Vol. III. p. 248, are of opinion that Mr. Seddon was the first who openly professed the Socinian creed; and Dr. Priest-

place in 1769, to your election, and that of my other esteemed friend on my left, (being upwards of 40 years) the important, and peculiar doctrines of Unitarian belief, were rarely, indeed I believe scarcely ever urged on the attention of the congregation. In avoiding the discussion, and even the declaration of the particular principles of the congregation over which your predecessors presided, there can be no doubt that those gentlemen had satisfied their own minds that they were executing their duties in a manner best calculated for public usefulness ; and though I do not concur in the views which regulated their conduct, yet I censure them not, for they acted conscientiously ;—the tomb has closed upon them with honour—and I participate in the respect with which their memory is regarded. The effect, however, of their conduct was such, that, when you, Sir, entered on your office of Minister, Unitarian doctrines were little understood by many of the congregation ; *by some they were not even recognized*.—On your part, therefore, it required a strong sense of duty, and a more than an ordinary degree of zeal and fortitude to encounter that spirit of hostility, with which, *from the then prevailing prejudices, the avowal and introduction of such doctrines were regarded*. Happily, Sir, the attainments and the qualities of mind, which are required to develope and defend the system of pure Christianity, which we profess, were found in you ; and it was the earnest and able exertion of those qualities and attainments, to effect this important purpose, which has, in a great measure produced that decided *Unitarian tone and character* which the Cross-street Congregation now enjoys. But, Sir, our acknowledgments should not be confined to the beneficial results upon your own congregation of those discussions, which in this neighbourhood you originated ; they have operated more extensively ; they have given an impulse to Unitarian enquiry, and your example and success have

ley in his Memoirs, p. 48, (being then resident at Warrington, and himself in the Arian stage of his declension from the Truth) says, ‘ the only Socinian in the neighbourhood, was Mr. Seddon of Manchester, and we all wondered at him.’—Editors.

stimulated others to the open avowal and propagation of pure and primitive Christianity.—We are constantly, Sir, hearing of the fame of preachers whose sentiments are pompously denominated orthodox and evangelical; how deserving, then, are Ministers like you, who hold and teach a faith, in our estimation, much better, and purer; and who, in the fearless discharge of their duty, in the words of your farewell text, “have not shunned to declare the whole counsel of God.” Sir, the recollection of the advantages which, as members of a dissenting congregation, we have derived from your labours, and the kind and consoling attentions which many amongst us have received from you, when afflictions have pressed them, will secure for you, in your separation from us, a durable and affectionate regard. As a testimony of this regard, it is now my pleasing duty to present you with this Service of Plate, and to express to you the most sincere and earnest wishes for your future health, welfare, and happiness.—(This address was received throughout with GREAT APPLAUSE.)

The REV. MR. GRUNDY said, it was impossible for him not to be deeply agitated with emotion on such an occasion as the present; nor could he, in any degree, find language for the feelings that affected him:—for how could he acknowledge to his kind friend in the chair the high encomiums he had passed upon him,—how could he express his obligations to those Gentlemen who, in the last fortnight, had sent him many most affectionate letters expressive of their esteem,—or how could he thank them for the NOBLE PRESENT they had now given him? (*Applause.*) It was impossible to remove from any stage of useful activity without regret; and it had been his lot to change more than once—the Cross-street congregation being the third with which he had been connected—and from all of them he had received the greatest kindness, but from none so great as from that he was now addressing. It was an additional source of regret, that *he and his congregation had not been better acquainted*: and he wished, in his heart, that it had been otherwise. (*Applause.*) Such an acquaintance would have

added to his happiness, and to their comforts. In such large towns as Manchester, a Minister had great difficulties in obtaining a knowledge of his congregation : and in his own case, it happened that he seldom met his congregation except in the walls of the Chapel on Sundays. But it was not altogether with emotions of regret that he separated from them, for some advantages, he thought, might arise from an occasional change of Ministers. A change might stimulate activity—it might encrease the attachment of the congregation to the remaining Minister—it might excite greater zeal in the Minister that left, and occasion the public avowal of opinions in places where they had not been previously propagated. It was also an additional pleasure to him in leaving, that the circumstance had drawn from his congregation so ample a testimony of their attachment to the principles they professed. It had been the singular fortune of the Cross-street congregation, never to have changed their Ministers, except when age and infirmity, or death, had rendered it necessary. Singular also was their conduct in this instance of one of them leaving—for *he had no recollection, that on a similar occasion, any congregation had given to their Minister a testimonial of their regard equal to that he had the honour of receiving.\** It often, indeed, happened, that the quitting of a Minister was occasioned by some difference with his congregation, or produced itself a temper of hostility on one side or the other. He remembered an instance in which a Minister, in taking leave of his congregation, had told them in the morning that he had forty-seven charges against them ; twenty-seven of which he should then urge, and the remaining twenty he should prefer in the afternoon. (*Laughter.*) He remembered another instance where a Minister had raked

\* Admitting the correctness of this opinion, the Manchester Unitarians have since surpassed themselves. ONE THOUSAND GUINEAS were raised and presented to the Rev. J. G. Robberds, the colleague and junior of Mr. Grundy, but privately and by a deputation—*no dinner*—NO SPEECHES. An Unitarian Chapel has been opened in Salford which adjoins Manchester : but the dinner was at two shillings a head, (the Harris dinner tickets were not so low) and NO SPEECHES. Are not these signs of the times ?—Editors.

up the ashes of the dead for the means of censuring his hearers. He, was however, happy to have no ground of complaint; since he had come amongst them, he had experienced nothing but kindness, both from the congregation as a body, and from the trustees;—even in pecuniary concerns, the conditions had been more than fulfilled, the trustees having regularly encreased the stipend of himself and his esteemed colleague, till, at that time, they were in the receipt of nearly one hundred pounds per annum more than had been promised. (*Applause.*)

\* Mr. NAYLOR, the Vice-President, *begged to be indulged with permission to say a few words on this occasion. It had been remarked in history, on the death of one of the ROMAN EMPERORS, that his loss was not merely of a public nature but was deeply felt by the private citizens.* THIS CASE PRESENTED AN ANALOGY TO THE LOSS ABOUT TO BE SUSTAINED IN THE LAMENTABLE DEPARTURE OF MR. GRUNDY. His loss would be both publicly and privately felt.

“The Rev. Charles Wellbeloved, and prosperity to the Manchester College, at York.”—In proposing this toast, the Vice-President took occasion to advert to the great benefits this Institution had derived from the exertions of Mr. G. W. Wood.

† Mr. G. W. WOOD briefly replied, referring to the reports of the Institution.

“The Colleague of our late worthy Minister, the Rev. John Robberds, and may the Cross-street congregation long be benefited by his valuable services.”

Rev. J. G. ROBBERDS said, to be present this day to witness the tribute bestowed on one of their Ministers, would be an encouragement to him, if he stood in need of encouragement, to labour in support of truth—but he had been present that day where he had received encouragement far more congenial to his mind. It had been his lot to stand

\* Formerly the Rev. Mr. Naylor, and sometime minister of the chapel in Sheffield, which was once occupied by the celebrated Timothy Jollie.—Editors.

† Son of the late Rev. Mr. Wood, Unitarian Minister of the originally orthodox chapel Mill Hill, Leeds; Treasurer of the Manchester College, York; and a Trustee of Platt chapel, near Manchester. (See Appendix.)—Editors.



beside the sick bed of a friend who, in health, would have rejoiced in being present on this occasion, but who, he feared, might never more be seen among them. Impressed as that friend was with the consciousness of departing existence, he had enquired from him the state of his feelings and opinions at the near prospect of death. He answered that, for upwards of twenty years, he had made his religious principles the subject of most serious and anxious consideration, and he now found them abundantly sufficient for his support on that solemn occasion. This was the kind of encouragement most satisfactory to him. To find that the principles he taught, imparted comfort and consolation in the closing hours of life, was to him a source of happiness. (*This pathetic allusion powerfully affected the Meeting.*) He had, last night, conversed with one who had formerly been a Unitarian, and who had had many opportunities of knowing their conduct, and he found, from reasoning with him, that though he acknowledged the general propriety of their domestic habits, yet he urged that they were deficient in reverential regard for religious exercises—that the cultivation of devotional feelings was too much neglected in their education. He had heard this charge against Unitarians, and must admit, that there were amongst them, as, no doubt, there were among other religious classes, many who neither understood nor felt the importance and value of their religious duties. If Unitarian Ministers would preach with effect and usefulness, they must in every respect, be true disciples of their Master, and to follow his example was the great test of being his disciples.—He assured his late colleague, and the Meeting, of the sentiments of regard he felt for them, and concluded by wishing, from the bottom of his heart, that Mr. Grundy might through life, enjoy all the satisfaction a Christian Minister could desire. He sat down amidst *rapturous and long continued applauses.*

The Rev. Mr. GRUNDY gave “Long health and happiness to Mr. Richard Potter,” *which was drank* STANDING, *and with the utmost* ENTHUSIASM.

Mr. POTTER.—With the toast to which I now solicit your attention is connected the name of a gentleman whose

active but unostentatious philanthropy entitles him to every demonstration of respect. I know no individual more estimable for the unassuming exercise of every benevolent feeling—none to whom the poet's description

‘To do good by stealth and blush to find it fame.’\*

more justly applies. I have the greatest pleasure in proposing “Mr. Joseph Mason, and the Trustees of the Cross-street Chapel.”

The VICE-PRESIDENT returned thanks on the behalf of Mr. Mason, who was absent; and Mr. GRUNDY paid a handsome tribute both to his public and private character.

The CHAIRMAN gave—“The Rev. George Harris, and may the zeal which he has been instrumental in kindling, prove itself to be such as ought to burn in every Christian bosom,” which BEING DRANK WITH MUCH APPLAUSE,

Mr. HARRIS addressed the Meeting to the following effect.—I beg to thank you, most sincerely, for the honour you have conferred upon me in drinking my health. I should be wanting in feeling, were I not to be grateful for the kind manner in which my name has been received by this respectable company; I can truly say, that I receive it both as a reward and an encouragement. I have felt very great satisfaction in being enabled, by the kindness of friends, to join with you this day, in expressing our mutual obligations to our respected friend on your right. I have said, mutual obligations; for, though I have not had the advantages which you have enjoyed, of being one of his stated hearers, or of forming part of the society over which he was one of the esteemed and respected Pastors, yet for many of my greatest pleasures I am indebted to that individual. Mr. Grundy may, perhaps, be surprised, but I hope not displeased, when I state to this company, that it was principally owing to the sentiments, which I heard him deliver in London, in the year 1811, and to the exertions which he made to diffuse a spirit of enquiry in this town—the influence of which has been felt through the kingdom—

\* It is impossible not to admire the felicitous humour of Mr. Potter, and the exquisite subtlety of his irony, if he meant to apply this quotation to the body of Unitarian Trustees. “Do good by STEALTH, and blush to find it FAME!” He might have actually foreseen the issue of that day's proceedings.—Editors.

that I was led to quit the business in which I was at that period engaged, and to devote myself to the Christian Ministry. I feel myself, in some measure, indebted to that respected individual; and, therefore, it is that I have experienced great satisfaction in being able to be present at this Meeting, to join with you, in the expression of your thanks to him for his services as your Pastor, and also for the opportunity it affords me of begging him, at the same time, to accept my own personal acknowledgments.—I well remember, that at the period to which I allude, that individual dwelt much upon the vital importance of preaching the truths of Unitarian Christianity to the poor;—upon our attention being directed, not merely to one class of society (and that class the rich and powerful,) but that it was absolutely necessary, our individual and united efforts should be directed and devoted to the instruction and the amelioration of the condition of the great mass of the people. It is a lesson which I hope I have never forgotten;—it is a lesson which I trust I have invariably endeavoured to reduce to practice. I wish the great mass of mankind to be not merely hewers of wood, and drawers of water, but rational and enlightened beings; and, therefore, it is I am anxious they should know the truth, believing as I do, that the truth will make them free. The human race has been long enough, I think, like Issachar crouching down between the two burdens of ecclesiastical and civil despotism. I wish them to know their rights as the children of God, and the heirs of immortality, that knowing, they may dare to maintain them. Indifference on such a subject, by those who have really felt the value of the principles they profess to believe, appears to me to be a thing which it is almost impossible to imagine;—and as to timidity, where truth and duty are concerned, no one can be a Christian reformer whilst that quality forms a prominent part of his character. Truth ought to be openly advocated, whether people will hear, or whether they will forbear.—Those who seriously mark the signs of the times, and those minds are alive to the interests of humanity, must be convinced, that the present period is peculiarly favourable to the dissemination of correct principles on

every subject of human interest or enquiry. There are periods, certainly, in which the mind of man, seems to slumber, in which truth appears to have no beauty that she should be desired; and when knowledge and freedom are totally disregarded. But the present, I take it, is not such a period. Now the human mind is active and stirring. Long pressed down by CREEDS AND KINDRED ABOMINATIONS, it is now, with a giant's strength, casting them by as the tales of other times, and is bursting forth in all the vigour and maturity of its powers. The toys which pleased, or which frightened the infancy of humanity, will be despised in the manhood of its nature;—and it is much to be feared, unless the advocates of pure and undefiled religion, boldly proclaim their principles, that, along with the old wrinkled skin of corruption, many may cast away at the same time, the pure and perfect form of truth. If the friends of rational belief stand aloof whilst men's minds are thus busy, this must inevitably be the case. Indifference, therefore, now to the peculiar doctrines, by the belief of which we are distinguished, must be an error of the greatest magnitude; and may be pregnant with incalculable mischiefs.—Mr. Wilberforce, as you no doubt recollect, Sir, once characterized Unitarians as the HALF-WAY HOUSE TO INFIDELITY. His assertion was given with an insinuation, and a sneer, or else, I think, there are *affirmations much more wide of the truth, than even this assertion of the Honourable Gentleman's*; for Unitarianism I believe to be the half-way house between Infidelity on the one hand, and Fanaticism on the other. I trust many of us have felt, that it is a *pleasant and salubrious abode*, cheering to the heart, and invigorating to the mind, equally removed from the *demon warmth of superstition*, and the iceberg coldness of irreligion; and, therefore, we must be anxious, if we be men of benevolence, that the number of our happy companions should be increased. But, if we stand idly by, and never point the attention of our fellow-creatures to the *comforts of our habitation*, we are justly chargeable of connivance to the errors into which human beings may fall, in consequence of our negligence:—we are guilty of inflicting upon them, as far as our power

goes, one of the torments of Milton's hell—they are first steeped in *the liquid fire of superstition*, and then plunged into the soul-congealing cold of infidelity. Every man, then endowed with benevolent affections, who has embraced Unitarianism, as the truth of the living God, must be anxious, if he feel correctly, that his principles should be openly advocated, and constantly kept before the minds of his fellow-creatures, and that the good and knowledge of freedom, may, by these means, be carried to every cottage in the land.—I am confident, that I am addressing men of liberality and intelligence;—men who are anxious for the improvement, the freedom, and the happiness of the race of which they form a part; and, therefore, I am the more desirous of impressing on your minds the vast and unspeakable importance of Unitarianism, as a means of human civilization and instruction. This is a point of view in which, I think, it has not yet been sufficiently considered, even by its friends; but it is one of which I think, it is admirably deserving, and which will appear the more clearly, if we contrast for a moment, the spirit which the two opposing systems are calculated to generate. *For what is the spirit of ORTHODOXY? Is it not a SLAVISH spirit? but the spirit of Unitarianism is one of rational and enlightened liberty. The spirit of Orthodoxy is a MEAN spirit, for it bends before the dictation of a worm of the earth, and its essence consists, as its own advocates aver, in the "prostration of the human understanding;" but the spirit of Unitarianism is open, generous, liberal. The one is PARTIAL AND CAPRICIOUS, viewing the favourites of Heaven only in a selected few, whilst Unitarianism sees in every man, a brother, training up for the glorious importance which awaits all the family of the Eternal. The spirit of Orthodoxy is a CRUEL AND VINDICTIVE spirit; witness its excommunications and its inquisitions;—the spirit of Unitarianism is merciful and benevolent; ANXIOUS FOR MAN'S RIGHTS,\* and detesting revenge. The spirit of Orthodoxy is*

\* It is gratifying to be assured on such authority, that the Unitarians are "*anxious for man's rights*," as that anxiety will necessarily impel them to restore all the perverted endowments and funds, to their legitimate and orthodox purposes.—Editors.

**ONE OF PERSECUTION:**—*look at the Athanasian Creeds, and Test and Corporation Acts ; see the unbeliever—oh ! shame and scandal!—even in the nineteenth century, dragged before the tribunal of man, to answer for his supposed want of faith, and behold Judges acting under the abused name of that Christianity, which, they say, is part and parcel of the law of the land, inflicting sentences, which even the worst of crimes would scarcely sanction ; but Unitarianism is free as the winds of Heaven, and desires that every human creature may be so too. Orthodoxy says it encourages inquiry ; it may do so to a certain point ; but when a human being arrives at that, it is the language of its DEEDS, hitherto shalt thou go, but no further.—Unitarianism, however, has no land-marks on the shores of knowledge—like the swelling waves of the ocean, it is spirit and it is life. Orthodoxy would strip a man of the name of Christian, and would shut him out from all the rewards of Heaven, unless he can pronounce the shibboleth of an intolerant party ; whilst Unitarianism affirms, that in every nation, age, and in every sect, he who feareth God, and worketh righteousness, shall be accepted of him. Orthodoxy is bound up in CREEDS and CONFESSIONS, and ARTICLES OF FAITH, with INKY BLOTS, and rotten PARCHMENT BONDS ;—but Unitarianism, like the word of the ever-living Jehovah, is NOT, AND CANNOT BE BOUND. Orthodoxy is GLOOM, and DARKNESS, and DESOLATION.—Unitarianism is light, and liberty, and joy. The influence of this system on human civilization, human liberty, and human happiness, has already been tried ; it has been tried for ages ; and its DIREFUL AND DEMORALIZING EFFECTS MAY BE READ IN THE HISTORY OF EVERY NATION UNDER THE SUN. It has been weighed, Sir, and has it not been found most miserably wanting? Let the state-craft, and the priest-craft, the war and the slavery, by which mankind have been cursed for ages, answer the question. What then remains ; but that every friend of his species should unite, in trying the effects of the other system ; Providence is manifestly aiding the labours of its avowed defenders, by raising up advocates where we should least have expected to find them—amongst the political economists of our common country. It has*

long ago been said, that if you touch John Bull's pocket, it has a wonderful effect in enlightening his understanding. And depend upon it, the political economists of England, will one day put it to him—whether it be worthwhile to pay two hundred thousand pounds a year for *each* of the thirty-nine articles, and the Athanasian creed to boot, and it requires no great sagacity, I think, to foretel in which way he will answer the question. The time will assuredly come, when churches established by DIVINE GRACE, and the END OF THE BAYONET, and the CONSTABLE'S STAFF, will be known no more,—and when the altar, whether to the unknown God, or with THIRTY-NINE HORNS, on which to impale the consciences of human beings, will be remembered only as things that have been. In the full confidence that such a period is approaching, I cannot frame a better wish for you, myself, and the race of man, than that the individual and united efforts of all the friends of human perfectibility, may cause the truth to issue forth armed with all the Omnipotence of her author ;—may she chase from the world all its ills, and give to and bless mankind with her own charities. The bright and hallowed visions of the Poet—the expectations of the Philanthropist—and the belief of the Christian, will thus, and only thus be realized.—Yes, Sir,

“ When the glad slave shall at her feet lay down  
 His broken chain ; the tyrant lord his crown ;  
 The priest his book ; the conqueror his wreath ;  
 And from the lips of Truth, one mighty breath  
 Shall like a whirlwind scatter in its breeze  
 The whole dark pile of human mockeries ;—  
 Then shall the reign of Mind commence on earth,  
 And starting fresh as from a second birth,  
 Man in the sunshine of the world's new spring,  
 Shall walk in glory like a holy thing.” \*

The Report concludes, with a toast in favour of the independence of Greece which was followed by an eloquent speech from Mr. Shuttleworth, entirely on that topic ; with the statement that the remaining toasts gave rise to able

\* The tumultuous plaudits which attended and followed this speech, occasioned the alarm of fire, to which allusion is made in the letter of “ An Orthodox Observer.”—Editors.

speeches from several gentlemen present; and the information that the company broke up at eleven o'clock.

---

*To the Editor of the Manchester Gazette.*

SIR,—It was to be expected, that the copious account in your paper of the speeches delivered at the farewell dinner lately given to the Rev. J. Grundy would, as exhibiting the sentiments of a numerous and highly respectable company, excite considerable attention. Yet, in the fact of that entertainment having occurred, and of such remarks having been offered, as appeared to gentlemen present to be called for by the occasion, there was nothing out of the ordinary course, or so far implicating persons of other denominations as to require or even to justify, any public stricture or remark. It was right that they should testify their respect for Mr. Grundy. It was for that very purpose they assembled. It was natural and right, too, on their part, that they should avow their belief in their peculiar doctrines—that they should eulogize their own denomination, and that they should declare, in terms as strong as they pleased, the reasons and degree of their preference. But the speech of the Reverend Mr. Harris breathes such a spirit of hostility and defiance, and makes such a violent attack upon the principles of all those from whom Unitarians differ, as to afford just ground of serious complaint. This Reverend Gentleman, indeed, presents, like the others, his respects to Mr. Grundy, to whom he confesses particular obligations; he describes the Unitarian system as a most commodious half-way house, situate in the happiest of all possible climates; and so far all was appropriate: but, not content with blessing the inmates of his favourite abode, he pronounces something very much like a malediction on all those who choose to inhabit another. I would not willingly infer the spirit of Unitarianism from the diatribe of this Reverend Gentleman, but if constrained to do so, I must acknowledge that it is as little remarkable for courtesy and decorum as it is for a sound intelligence, fairness and candour. Had this speech been delivered on another occasion, it might have passed as merely the effusion



of the individual ; but it has been adopted by the Manchester Unitarians. Or if a speech, uttered under those very circumstances, had impugned the opinions of others, by argument or reasoning, it could only have been said, that, to choose such a time for theological controversy, was by no means an example of good taste : but Mr. Harris, as the organ of that meeting, assumes the office of Public Accuser, and, like the Attorneys General, during the Dynasty of the Stuarts, without adducing the shadow of evidence, makes great part of his speech to consist of railing and invective.

The passage to which I more particularly allude is that in which Mr. H. professes to contrast the spirit of Orthodoxy and the spirit of Unitarianism, which commences thus : “ For what is the spirit of Orthodoxy ? Is it not a *slavish* spirit ? ” and in the course of which he denounces the spirit of Orthodoxy as “ *mean, partial and capricious, cruel and vindictive ; and a spirit of persecution.* ” He declares further, that the spirit of Orthodoxy “ *bends before the dictation of a worm of the earth,* ”—that its acknowledged essence is in “ *the prostration of the understanding ;* ” and he attains his climax by the following terms :—“ *Orthodoxy is gloom and darkness, and desolation,* ” and by ascribing to it “ *direful and demoralizing effects.* ”

And is this the spirit, and are these the terms, with which Manchester Unitarians regard and describe their orthodox neighbours ? Will no language adequately convey their feelings concerning us, but that of abhorrence and contempt ? To meet these violent and sweeping charges, which include the majority of professing Christians in this country, both in and out of the Establishment, it would suffice to say, that they are as unfounded as they were unprovoked, and that they betray on the part of those who make them, but little information, or but little reflection ; we refer, however, to the history of generations of Orthodox believers as a triumphant refutation of them all.

Will it be said of the Martyrs of Queen Mary’s reign, that they were of a *mean* and *slavish* spirit, that *they bent before the dictation of a worm of the earth ?* Yet they were full of the spirit of Orthodoxy. Were the Puritans servile adherents

of power ; did they bend before human authority, and did the essence of their religion consist in “ *the prostration of the understanding?*” Yet who more orthodox than they? Were the two thousand Confessors, who on Bartholomew’s Day, relinquished their Livings for conscience sake, men whose spirit was “ *slavish, mean, vindictive, cruel and persecuting?*” In a word, are we to ascribe to the persecuted Covenanters of Scotland, and Non-conformists of England, all that “ *darkness, gloom and desolation,*” and all those “ *direful and demoralizing effects,*” on which the Rev. Mr. Harris delights to declaim? These were the champions of Orthodoxy,—and these were the very men whose “ *faithfulness unto death,*” prepared the way for the glorious Revolution, and the chartered recognition of the rights of conscience.

These accusations come with a peculiar ill-grace from Unitarians. As a body they are of recent origin, in this country at least. During the period of the great struggles for liberty they were unknown ; and they did not arise until the object was achieved—until the battle was fought, and the victory won. The Orthodox laboured, and the Unitarians have entered into their labours. Let them, therefore, not stigmatise the very spirit which led to resist, and eventually to overcome ecclesiastical tyranny, as “ *slavish and mean ;*” let them not call the spirit of Confessors and Martyrs, “ *cruel and vindictive ;*” let them not injuriously asperse the memory of men, by whom so many of the chapels, which they now occupy, were built and endowed, and to whom under God, they owe the very blessings by which they are surrounded.

I cannot but repeat my unfeigned regret, that the Unitarians of Manchester should have suffered themselves on an occasion not merely of convivial harmony, but of the interchange of friendly feeling, to make such a demonstration of animosity against, not the opinions, but the spirit and character, of all those who conscientiously differ from them.

I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,

AN ORTHODOX DISSENTER.

Manchester, August 20th, 1824.

*To the Editor of the Manchester Gazette.*

SIR ;—It was a saying of Dr. Samuel Johnson, that he never thought he had hit hard unless it rebounded ; and when I read the letter inserted in your valuable paper of the 28th August, signed “ An Orthodox Dissenter,” I was forcibly reminded of the Doctor’s sentiment. It would have been well, I think, had your Correspondent attached his name to his communication, for it is scarcely consistent with fairness to make an anonymous attack on the person and principles of an individual. I must also protest against my address involving “ the Manchester Unitarians ” in any blame. I am alone responsible for what I uttered. Though your Correspondent assumes that I was “ the organ of that meeting,” and has kindly given me “ the office of public accuser,” and dubbed me an “ Attorney General,” they are stations, to which I make, and have no claim. No person but myself is accountable for any sentiment delivered by me at the meeting alluded to.

Your Correspondent has mistaken my meaning, and therefore misrepresented me. Those who know me, will testify, that I always draw a broad distinction between the *professors* of a bad system, and the *system* itself. The system I may deprecate and abhor ; the persons I may esteem and honour. This is my situation with regard to Orthodoxy. Conscientiously believing it to be false and pernicious, I feel it to be an imperative duty to do all I can to destroy its influence by uprooting its belief ; but, at the same time, I respect numbers of its professors, and love them for their works sake. The benevolence of their hearts causes them to gain a righteous victory over the creeds which they profess, and I glory in their triumph.

Had your Correspondent attended to the sentence which introduces the passage that appears to have given him so much offence, he would have perceived that it was the *system*, not the persons of those who professed it, that I was condemning. I had said, that Unitarianism was an important “ means of human civilization and instruction,” but that

Orthodoxy I regarded as the reverse ; and I went on to declare that this would “appear the more clearly, if we contrast for a moment, the spirit which the two opposing *systems* are calculated to generate.” I also affirmed, “that in every nation, aye, in every sect, he who feareth God, and worketh righteousness, shall be accepted of him.” Can this be called an *attack on persons*? Will your Correspondent say that *Unitarian Christians*, if righteous men, will be saved in the great day of the Lord? If he will, I congratulate him on his charity, but he will no longer have any right to the title of “an *Orthodox* dissenter.” I said that “the spirit of Orthodoxy is a mean spirit, for it bends before the dictation of a worm of the earth, and its essence consists, as its own advocates aver, in the prostration of the human understanding ;” and will your Correspondent deny the existence of creeds and confessions of faith, some of which the students are obliged to sign their belief in ere they can taste the blessings of knowledge at the most celebrated of our Universities? Or will he say that the latter part of the sentence is not the language of the Bishop of London’s primary visitation charge? That the spirit of Orthodoxy is cruel and vindictive, and persecuting, I referred to inquisitions, and the Athanasian Creed, and Test and Corporation Acts to prove. Can he deny their existence; or can he say that Carlile and his assistants are not in prison? I said that Orthodoxy was “direful and demoralizing” in its effects; and for my evidence, I referred to the state of the world at large. I said that “Orthodoxy is gloom and darkness and desolation;” and let the unfortunate inmates of many of the lunatic asylums, and the testimony of even Orthodox physicians to this point, be my justification.

But your Correspondent flies off to persons, and he adduces the Martyrs, and the Puritans, and the two thousand Confessors, and the Covenanters and Nonconformists, to show that Orthodoxy, and a love of liberty, are not incompatible; and I might answer his appeal by inquiring who made men Martyrs, Puritans, &c. &c.? Was it not the

Ruling Powers ; and were not they Orthodox ? If we must judge of the spirit of a system from the conduct of the majority of its professors, his own examples prove the validity of my assertions, for so grievous was the tyranny of the Orthodox majority, that it caused the righteous rebellion of the holy men he has enumerated. I willingly and gladly admit, that, to the conduct of these persecuted beings, we owe many of our civil privileges : though, perhaps, for the most important of them, we are indebted to our Catholic ancestors. But, as to their notions of religious freedom, even your Correspondent, I should think, will not stand up for their purity. If he do, let him reconcile the Act in King William's reign against the impugnors of the Trinity, and a similar Act in Scotland, with any rational principles of liberty ; to say nothing of the liberty which the Covenanters preached, which was for themselves, and not for others ; or the practice under the Protector's government. Let him also show how these Acts could have been passed if Unitarians, "during the great struggles for liberty, were unknown." It is not usual, I believe, to frame Acts of Parliament against unknown people ; nor let your Correspondent ever forget that the man whose writings contributed the most essentially to establish the principles of "the glorious Revolution," was an Unitarian Christian—and that man was JOHN LOCKE.

I have no wish to "injuriously asperse the memory of men by whom so many of the chapels which they (the Unitarians,) now occupy, were built and endowed." I have no doubt that, in building and endowing chapels, they were actuated by upright and pious and benevolent motives. But I may be allowed to say, that I am sorry they did endow them, because I look upon endowments as prejudicial to the progress of dissent—to tend to indifference and lukewarmness, and to produce endless vexations.

With every good wish for your Correspondent's happiness, both here and hereafter, I am your obedient servant,

GEORGE HARRIS.

*To the Editor of the Manchester Gazette.*

SIR;—I crave permission to offer in your pages a few remarks, in reply to the observations of a Correspondent, who signs himself, in your paper of Saturday, 28th August, “An Orthodox Dissenter.” I did indeed expect to see some notice taken of them in your paper of last week ; but, as that has not been the case, much as I dislike the discussion of religious topics in the columns of a newspaper, I feel myself called upon to step forward and correct the misapprehension under which your Correspondent labours, of the sentiments entertained by the great body of Unitarian Christians in this town. I allude to his observations on the speech of the Rev. Mr. Harris, delivered at the dinner lately given to the Rev. J. Grundy, on occasion of his regretted removal to Liverpool, which speech your Correspondent considers as declaratory of the general sentiments of the Unitarian body in Manchester. “*Had this speech,*” he says, “*been delivered on another occasion, it might have passed as merely the effusion of the individual: but it has been adopted by the Manchester Unitarians ;*” and again, “Mr. Harris, the organ of that meeting, assumes the office of public accuser, and, like the Attornies General during the dynasty of the Stuarts, without adducing the shadow of evidence, makes great part of his speech to consist of railing and invective.”

Now, Sir, I must take this public opportunity of declaring that that speech does *not* exhibit the sentiments of a very large portion of the Manchester Unitarians towards their Orthodox brethren. With the views and feelings of the Rev. Gentleman who delivered that speech I have no concern: it is not for me to judge men’s motives ; his name is before the public, and he must answer for himself ; but I confess I should feel wanting in the respect which I owe to myself, and to the religious body to which I am proud to belong, if I allowed it to go forth, uncontradicted, to the world, that we subscribe to the truth and justice of senti-

ments, so hostile, as it seems to me, to the candid and charitable spirit of our common Christianity, or were the public led to believe, that any individual uttering them was the accredited organ of a Unitarian assembly. "Is this the spirit," your Correspondent exclaims, "and are these the terms with which Manchester Unitarians regard and describe their Orthodox neighbours? Will no language adequately convey their feelings concerning us, but that of abhorrence and contempt?" No, Sir, no; I will take upon myself to assert, on behalf of the mass of those with whom I rejoice to think and act, that this is *not* the spirit—that these are not the terms with which the Manchester Unitarians regard and describe their Orthodox neighbours. Sincerely and conscientiously attached to their own views of Christian truth, and willing to encounter all the opprobrium to which an honest avowal of their unpopular and misrepresented tenets may often expose them, they are, at the same time, firmly convinced that "the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart;" and I am certain it is their earnest wish, so far as it is possible, without compromising their principles, to live peaceably with all good men, by "speaking the truth in love."

They do not, indeed, deny, that they think their own principles, when properly understood, consistently in unison with the spirit of rational liberty, and conducive to the best and highest interests of the human species; they do not disguise their wish, that these principles, as identified in their view with the pure truth of God, should be widely diffused through society;—but, when they consider how many shining examples of piety and virtue may be found in all sects; when they recollect how many, in the belief of a creed widely different from their own, have been distinguished champions of civil and religious liberty, they dare not arrogate to themselves an exclusive monopoly of all that is liberal and philanthropic in religious sentiment; but willingly believe, that the great practical ends of existence may be, and often are, answered under very different modes of faith, and that, in particular, wherever there is a deep

reverence for the Scriptures themselves, as the sole and efficient rule of faith, and a devoted attachment to the memory of Jesus Christ as the great exemplar of our moral duties—there, whatever may be the errors of the understanding, the heart will be pure and good, and the life springing from it such as the Judge of all will not be ashamed to own at the last great day. The Unitarians of Manchester would be very loath to be thought deficient in respect for the memory of their Puritanical forefathers. They would reverence in every one, even in a Jew or a Mussulman, the conscientious sacrifice of interest on the altar of truth ; and, though they may have departed from the form of faith bequeathed to them by the founders of their churches, yet they still feel themselves entitled to rejoice in their religious descent, and to exercise all the privileges of heirs, because the adoption of their present opinions has resulted from carrying to their full extent the principles of their illustrious ancestors, and reverencing the pure word of God, far above all the creeds and formularies of man.—I trust, Sir, this statement will convey a sufficient assurance to the world, that the Unitarians, as a body, are not deficient in a spirit of kindness and charity towards their Orthodox brethren. Perhaps they do not always meet with a return of that good-will, which it is their earnest wish and uniform endeavour to exhibit towards others. For acting in compliance with the dictates of their consciences, they are too often exposed to the obloquy of their fellow Christians ; “their good is evil spoke of ;” and they are rudely cast out from the general community of believers, as utter “aliens from the commonwealth of Israel.”—Nor is it surprising, considering the frailty of our nature, that occasionally some more fiery spirits should resent this reiteration of wrongs and calumnies with a warmth and vehemence, that Christian charity cannot justify. But surely, Sir, it is unreasonable to consider these sallies of heat as the calm and deliberate expression of the sentiments of the body at large ; and, perhaps, your correspondent himself has been betrayed, (I doubt not that it was unconsciously,) into the very feeling



of which he complains, when he confines his animadversions to the speech of the Rev. Mr. Harris, and takes no notice of the toast, which was received with such applause, "Our brethren of all religious denominations," nor of the very serious and devotional spirit, which characterized the observations of the Rev. Mr. Robberds.

Upon the whole, however, I rejoice to bear my willing testimony to the liberal and candid tone which pervades the observations of your correspondent; I trust it is a pledge, that a kinder and gentler spirit will, ere long, prevail amongst professors of different denominations; a delightful earnest, that those blessed times are approaching, when the invidious distinctions of orthodox and heretic shall be confounded in the universal zeal to exemplify the beautiful precept of our common Lord and Master; "By this shall all men know ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another."

I am, Sir, your's, respectfully,

AN UNITARIAN CHRISTIAN.

*Manchester, Sept. 9th, 1824.*

---

*To the Editor of the Manchester Gazette.*

SIR;—Feeling equally reluctant to newspaper discussion with your intelligent Correspondent who signs himself "An Unitarian Christian," I should not have troubled you for the insertion of a few additional lines, had I not felt it my duty to acknowledge the very candid and manly spirit by which his letter is distinguished. It is, indeed, impossible but that letter must, on the whole, be gratifying to all who have taken an interest in the subject, with the exception of an individual, who doubtless exceedingly regrets that he had not read it before he published his own.

I am convinced that "An Unitarian Christian" will, on re-consideration, readily do me the justice of owning that his complaint against me for confining my remarks to the speech of Mr. Harris, is groundless. So far from professing to review the whole proceedings of that day, I actually dis-

claimed that intention ; and I expressly stated, that my only reason for writing was, to notice the gratuitous and unfounded accusations which were conveyed to the public through the medium of that speech. I am sure, too, that, he will retract his imputation that I have "been betrayed into the same feeling of which I complain," an imputation which he will be the first to perceive he has rather hastily made, and which is as little consistent with the other parts of his own letter as with mine.

Having formed my ideas of the social character of the Unitarians from what is known of the Priestleys, the Lindseys, the Woods of the past generation, and their contemporaries, I had always, without in the slightest degree assenting to the truth of their theological opinions, ascribed to them a spirit of urbanity, and expected from them a mode of expression, such as that in which the Rev. Mr. Robberds spoke, and in which "An Unitarian Christian" writes. I am, therefore, not surprised that your Correspondent should, for himself, and for many of his brethren, disclaim all participation in a spirit which he justly describes as hostile to that of Christianity. This he does with indubitable evidence of sincerity and truth ; but the speech continues, notwithstanding, as much as ever identified with the proceedings of the gentlemen then assembled, and with the denomination which was then represented. It is fully understood, that, on all such occasions, those of the guests who are welcomed by a toast, are the accredited organs of the meeting, and that the toasts are prepared and appropriated to the different persons, for the very purpose of eliciting from them the expected declaration of sentiment and feeling. The toast given to Mr. Harris was striking,\* and his speech was evidently designed and received as the echo of the toast. The published Report contains no animadversion, by the Chairman, or any other person ; and the understanding out of doors is, that the speech was rewarded by

\* "The Rev. George Harris, and may the zeal which he has been instrumental in kindling, prove itself to be such as ought to burn in every Christian bosom."

extraordinary demonstrations of approval and applause. Indeed the whole publication at present bears the appearance of a manifesto, and this it will retain, until disavowed by some recognised representative and interpreter of the sentiments of that meeting. The Rev. Mr. Harris, indeed, in a letter given in the same number of your paper, offers himself to bear the responsibility of his speech; but that is gone beyond his power. The question now is, not whether your excellent Correspondent "An Unitarian Christian" possesses the spirit of candour and liberality, or whether Mr. Harris is willing to be personally answerable for what he then said—but it is, whether a disclaimer shall be received as on the part of that meeting, which is made by a gentleman who does not, from his letter, appear to have been so authorized; and whether the voluntary substitution of the individual, shall be accepted as the exoneration of the many. It is not difficult to foresee how these questions must be determined.

As I have no intention of troubling you again on this subject, you will perhaps allow me to embrace this opportunity of making a few remarks on the letter of the Rev. Speaker himself. Mr. Harris declares that I have mistaken his meaning, and of this he is the only competent judge; but that I have not mistaken the meaning of his words, is apparent from his letter, in which, I am sorry to perceive, he represents the very spirit, and reiterates every objectionable sentiment of his speech. His letter is, in truth, his speech over again, though somewhat diluted by the feebleness common to repetitions, and the employment of language less studied and compact.

When charges are, as in the present case, as deficient of precision, and even of plausibility, as of evidence, it is not always easy to repel them, without either confining oneself to a simple denial, or else becoming inconveniently prolix and diffuse. A few words will, however, suffice to evince the fallacies by which Mr. Harris is misled.

There are some sophists who affect to create distinctions

where there is no actual difference ; and there are others who confound together things which have no agreement or resemblance ; unhappily Mr. Harris uses both these forms. He errs alike by excess, and by deficiency of discrimination.

Nothing for example, can be more refined than his attempted distinction between "*the spirit generated by a system,*" and the spirit of those who are under the influence of that system. He says that those who know him, have witnessed his success in this subtle and apparently impracticable operation ; he declares that they are ready to testify that has he produced "*a broad distinction ;*" but, in his letter, and in his speech, that "*broad distinction*" dwindles into an imperceptible line, and it remains as little intelligible as ever, how any system can generate a spirit, from which spirit they who adopt that system may yet be free.

What again can be more unphilosophical, than to ascribe opposite effects to the same spirit? Yet this Mr. Harris attempts, by confounding the spirit of ecclesiastical domination, and the spirit of particular times, with the spirit of Orthodoxy. Orthodoxy, as every one (except the Rev. Mr. Harris) knows, is but another term for sound doctrine, and refers to doctrine only. It has no relation to forms of church government, or to modes of worship. Thus whether a man be an Episcopalian, a Presbyterian, or an Independent, he may be equally orthodox : or he may be either of these, and even rigidly and zealously so, and yet not be orthodox at all. Now, it is evident, that it could not be the same spirit which prompted Gardiner and Bonner to persecute, and which led Ridley and Latimer to suffer martyrdom ; it could not be the same spirit which dictated the act of uniformity, and which produced the self-denying conduct of the 2000 Ministers who resigned their livings,—the sufferers were undeniably moved by the spirit of Orthodoxy, and therefore, it is morally impossible, that their oppressors could have been so too. It is impossible again, that it could have been the same spirit which repealed, and which enacted the laws against the impugnors of the doc-

trine of the Trinity; and yet that all this, is not only possible, but actual, is the absurd conclusion at which Mr. Harris aims.

It is evident from the confused recapitulation of his charges against Orthodoxy, that Mr. Harris himself has no precise idea of what he would assail, and that he is not fully aware of the spirit he displays. With him, every thing that is not Unitarianism is Orthodoxy, and every thing Orthodox is "*false and pernicious*;" and "*its influence*" must be "*destroyed by uprooting its belief*." If this be not bigotry, it is impossible to say what bigotry is; and if Mr. Harris constrains us to admit, that the spirit of intolerance and the spirit of Orthodoxy are one, it will be due to him also to allow, that he has unknowingly furnished one of the purest examples of Orthodoxy in modern times.

Mr. Harris may expatiate at his ease, among Inquisitions and Creeds, and Test and Corporation Acts, with the various other elements which he has so strangely associated—they have as little relation to genuine Orthodoxy as to genuine Unitarianism; and were I gravely to undertake their refutation, I should justly incur the suspicion of being qualified to become an inmate of one Mr. Harris's "*lunatic asylums*," and a subject for the treatment of one of his "*Orthodox physicians*."—I gratefully accept, and most cordially return the good wishes with which Mr. H. concludes his letter;

And remain, Sir, your obedient Servant,

AN ORTHODOX DISSENTER.

*Manchester, Sept. 20, 1824.*

---

*To the Editor of the Manchester Gazette.*

SIR,—I have read with much interest the correspondence which has appeared in your very useful paper, on the subject of the philippic delivered by the Rev. George Harris, at the public dinner given in honour of the Rev. John Grundy. The form which that discussion has now assumed, is certainly the most agreeable to Orthodox dissenters that could be imagined.—The two Unitarians, who have appeared

as their opponents, have been the direct opponents of each other: the Rev. Mr. H. has struggled, by the aid of distinctions where there is no difference, to make a feeble stand, and his friend, the "Unitarian Christian," has determined to throw him overboard at once, as utterly indefensible. The last excellent letter of the "Orthodox Dissenter," has exposed the state of the case, in all its nakedness, to the amusement of many, and to the conviction of all.

There is one topic, however, which has been incidentally brought forward, in course of the discussion, but which has not obtained the degree of attention that some of your readers think it justly claims. It seems to be admitted, on all hands, that, in many instances, Unitarianism subsists, at the present time, upon funds and endowments, bequeathed by Orthodox Dissenters of past ages, for the support and propagation of their own religious sentiments. This fact is indeed too plain to be disputed. There is a property in Yorkshire understood to be now of great value, which was left by Lady Hewley, an Orthodox Christian, for purposes, of course, congenial with her own views, but which is now principally devoted, by the trustees, to the advancement of Unitarianism. Many, too, of the old dissenting chapels, which were universally built by persons of Orthodox sentiments, were also endowed by them with property, in some instances, to a very considerable amount. For instance, these remarks are applicable to Cross-street Chapel, in this town, the place most nearly connected with the occasion of the late public meeting of the Manchester Unitarians. That respectable and venerable erection is a monument of the piety and munificence of Orthodox Dissenters, of former times; and I am informed, I know not with what truth, that certain funds connected with that place have had the same origin. The comfortable accommodations, therefore, with which the Unitarian gentlemen of Manchester, find themselves surrounded every Lord's day, are to be numbered, I presume, among what they lately heard the Rev. Mr. H. pronounce "the direful and demoralizing effects" of Orthodoxy. I am

informed by a friend, that out of about thirty Unitarian places of worship in this county, more than two-thirds of that number were built by Trinitarians. And it may be safely asserted, that there are not a few places in England and Wales where Unitarianism must shortly give up its last expiring gasp, were it not for the reviving cordial thus afforded by the charity of departed Orthodox Christians. Now, Sir, it is surely matter of just surprise, that the vaunted magnanimity of Unitarians, displayed in discarding the "creeds and confessions" of the pious dead, should not have equally signalized itself in renouncing the property by which those "creeds and confessions," or the principles which they embrace, were unquestionably intended to be maintained.

It cannot be pleaded that this perversion of property from its original intention is slight or unimportant. In proof of the wide difference between the character of Orthodoxy and that of Unitarianism, I might appeal to the contrast drawn between the two in the late speech of the Rev. Mr. H. and to the representations of milder Unitarians, on different occasions. According to these gentlemen, if the one system be light, the other is darkness; if the one be health, the other is pestilence itself. Is it defensible, then, on any principles of justice, to apply the property left for the one of these very opposite purposes, to the advancement of the other? The Rev. Mr. H. admits that the commodious dwelling-place of Unitarians, is not farther removed from the region of Infidelity itself, than from what he calls the Fanaticism of the owners of this property. Infidelity it is true, has no funds and endowments, the fruits of the impiety of past ages, otherwise it follows, that Unitarianism would possess as fair a title to them, as to those under more immediate consideration. How far the members of that denomination would consider the goods and chattels of the infidel as desirable ornaments to their half-way house—it is not for me to determine: to these, however, they are as much the heirs as to those of the Orthodox, according to

the logic and theology which, it is understood, they so recently and so loudly applauded.

It may here be added, that, if they consider our views as so exceedingly pernicious, they cannot reasonably complain, if we think no better of their own, or if our charitable ancestors were no more favourably disposed towards them. Without offence, then, it may be assumed, that the pious dead, whose property is thus perverted from its original intention, would have devoted it to almost any other purpose, rather than that to which it is now made subservient. Should one of them rise from the grave, and find the chapel which he built, and the estates which he bequeathed, in the possession of a flaming modern Unitarian, I know no words in which he could express himself more fitly, than in those applied by our Saviour to Judas Iscariot,—“He that eateth bread with me hath lifted up his heel against me.”

It is surely no slight aggravation of this matter, that the mal-appropriation of which I complain, may be fairly deduced to be altogether unnecessary.—The Unitarians, in proportion to their number, are certainly a very rich people. Besides, according to the Rev. Mr. H. “the spirit of Unitarianism is open, generous, liberal, merciful, and benevolent,” and “like the swelling waves of the ocean.” Surely the liberality of such a system is sufficient to refresh its own bowels! Such an ocean cannot need to be replenished by the puny rill of Orthodox charity! It is true, I have met with very different representations of the spirit of Unitarianism, in reference to this particular.—From certain passages in the Memoirs of Mrs. Cappe, and in other Unitarian publications, I should have inferred something more parsimonious than accords with the reverend gentleman’s animated description: and, indeed, it might be well were he more sparing of such extravagant panegyric, until Unitarianism shall manage to subsist by its own proper energies.

In the correspondence which has occasioned these observations, the allusion of the “Orthodox Dissenter” to



this topic, has been very slightly passed over by his Unitarian opponents. The Rev. Mr. H. indeed, makes a flippant remark upon it, which implies, that he considers the funds and endowments in question as an injury, rather than a benefit to the people with whom he is connected.

If, however, endowments be injurious, the use which Unitarians have made of them, is a very likely means to prevent the evil in future; for it has brought this method of disposing of property into complete disrepute among Orthodox Dissenters, who are the only class of nonconformists that have shown much propensity this way.

I trust the Unitarians will impute to me no improper motive, if I have indulged great plainness of speech on this subject. They who could enjoy, with so much zest the tirade of the Rev. Mr. H. will, of course, be the last persons to blame me. The subject thus brought under review, is certainly one which cannot give to impartial persons the most favourable opinion of the tendency of their principles. I am strangely mistaken, if it does not present a more definite and striking proof of the "direful and demoralizing effects" of Unitarianism, than any which the Rev. Mr. H. has yet produced to justify himself in applying that language to the system of the Orthodox. I am desirous, therefore, of giving them an opportunity to explain themselves on this point, and to show upon what principle, consistent with justice and sound morality, Unitarian Ministers can consent to subsist upon property which was designed for any one rather than for them, and trustees can allow and encourage so corrupt a practice. If it can be defended, I should be glad to see *how*, for it is certainly what I never yet have seen.—I remain, Mr. Editor,

Your obedient Servant,

ANOTHER ORTHODOX DISSENTER.

*October 16, 1821.*

*To the Editor of the Manchester Gazette.*

*"It has been weighed Sir, and has it not been found most miserably wanting?"* Rev. George Harris's Speech.

SIR,—“The direful and demoralizing effects” of Unitarianism were, I doubt not, displayed, in my former letter to the conviction of all your impartial readers. For a people publicly to reprobate and calumniate principles by the efficiency of which they are, partly at least, provided with their daily bread, is certainly a stretch of ingratitude not easily to be surpassed. How such conduct can be shown to be consistent with good morals, is what I cannot even conjecture. In exposing it, I trust I am performing a duty to the public, to whom I beg to communicate, through the medium of your excellent paper, a few more illustrations of this interesting subject, and, particularly, some sketches of the Unitarian Chapels in several districts of the country, showing by whom they have been erected, endowed, &c. &c.

In the following list of Chapels in the neighbouring county of Chester, nothing is contained which is not believed to be substantially correct. Minor errors may possibly be pointed out, but it contains nothing which can materially affect the general statement of the case, so far as it is carried. I doubt not that a more perfect exposure of facts would greatly strengthen the argument against Unitarianism, and would in particular, bring to light more endowments than are here mentioned. In reference to nearly the whole of these places, I put it to any candid man, whether there be the least human probability, that Unitarianism would ever have at all existed in them, if it had not been insidiously grafted upon the stocks which had been previously planted and nourished by the labour and at the expence of Orthodox Dissenters. Let it be remembered, that these chapels were not only built by the energies of Orthodoxy, in times far less favourable for such exertions than the present, but they are now supported, partly at least, from the same source; I mean, by endowments which have been founded by Ortho-

dox Dissenters, and by grants from Lady Hewley's charity. And, with all the rest, let it not be forgotten, that the leading Unitarians of Manchester lately listened, with tumultuous applause, to their favourite orator, while he pronounced the spirit of Orthodoxy "slavish, mean, bending before the dictation of a worm of the earth, partial, capricious, cruel, vindictive." &c.

The above\* are the whole of the chapels occupied by the Unitarians in Cheshire. Upon this brief review of them, there are two questions which seem naturally to suggest themselves:—First, what is the amount of the means of religious instruction and improvement which has been *originated* in this important district, by the "generous, liberal, merciful, and benevolent" system called Unitarianism? Secondly, is Unitarianism producing, at present, in the chapels here enumerated, any thing like the moral and religious effects which were formerly produced in them by means of Orthodoxy? Let the candid answer, or even the Unitarians themselves, if they please. Judge gentle reader, from this specimen, of the vaunted moralizing powers of Unitarianism! I remain, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

ANOTHER ORTHODOX DISSENTER.

November 6, 1824.

---

*To the Editor of the Manchester Gazette.*

SIR,—The very extraordinary method adopted by the Manchester Unitarians, to manifest their respect for the professedly Christian ministry of the Rev. JOHN GRUNDY, in presenting him with a public dinner, and a "service of TEA PLATE," and their proceedings on this occasion, have excited towards that body unusual attention. It appears, by the report of their meeting, that they devoted seven hours (from four to eleven at night) to the task of eating and drinking, talking, clapping and shouting, sometimes laugh-

\* See Appendix, "Cheshire."

ing at the wit of one of their Clergy, and sometimes weeping at the pathos of another. What private pledging of each other there might be "before the cloth was removed," or how many toasts were given for which your valuable columns could not make room, we are only permitted to imagine: but fifteen toasts drunk "with the utmost enthusiasm," sometimes sitting and sometimes standing, produced nearly as many speeches! And all this was transacted in honour of Unitarianism! This was the way that 120 Clergy and Gentry of that persuasion, chose to manifest their Christian motives, principles and practices! This is the way in which the Unitarians honour and reward the Christian Ministry! "On the right of the Chairman," we are told, "sat the Rev. Mr. GRUNDY, and his colleague, the Rev. J. G. ROBERDS, at his left." The Vice President (himself) was the Rev. Mr. NAYLOR. We are not informed where the Rev. GEORGE HARRIS was seated, nor what other *Reverend* Gentleman graced the meeting with their *reverend* presence. The room, and indeed the neighbourhood, rang with their plaudits; and according to the description of the effects produced by their own eloquence, "*applause!*"—"*unbounded applause!*"—" *great applause throughout!*"—" *immense applause!*"—" *rapturous and long continued applause!*" successively attended their speeches, until, (as I am informed from another source,) an alarm of "*fire*" was excited amongst the populace without, who expected shortly to see the "Spread Eagle" in flames. There was, indeed, a small sprinkling of another feeling: for, they tell us, that the Chairman "was much affected;" but his speech was rewarded "throughout with great applause," nay more, the "pathetic allusion" of one of the Rev. Gentlemen, very "powerfully affected the meeting." Their griefs, however, like a summer's cloud, soon passed away, and the next moment, the gay Gentlemen returned to their old and more agreeable exercise of "*rapturous and long continued applause,*" and sorrow was an unbidden guest, and was speedily ordered out of doors. Dr. PRIESTLEY himself used

to think the Unitarians to be a merry set, "more cheerful and more happy," quoth he, than other people; and so they are—

" He that will not merry, merry be,  
" Shall never taste their joys."

Amidst this merriment, the health of the Rev. GEORGE HARRIS was given, "which being drunk with much applause," he rose, and proudly asked, aye, and proudly replied to his own question, "What is the spirit of Orthodoxy?" Is it not "slavish, mean, partial and capricious; cruel and vindictive?" &c. &c. "It is gloom, and darkness, and desolation;" "it has been tried for ages, and its direful and demoralizing effects may be read in the history of every nation under the sun." Admirable historian! *Query*: Has not Orthodoxy desolated the planets also?

Whether your correspondent, the "Unitarian Christian," was, or was not, present at the delivery of these sentiments, which he has since disavowed, is quite immaterial: for neither he nor any one else will deny the statement given to me by a person present, that they were received with thunders of applause by the very men who, with apparent sincerity, had, a few minutes before, drunk as a toast, "Our Brethren of all religious denominations!" This too, they tell us, was drunk with "unbounded applause!" Good cheer begets good humour, and both triumphed gloriously.

I heartily thank your correspondents, the two "Orthodox Dissenters" for the attention which they have bestowed on the last mentioned orator's unfounded aspersions; but to the statement of the latter I particularly wish to call the attention of your readers. Complaints, "not loud but deep," have been uttered from one end of England to another, against the Body of Unitarians, for their extraordinary invasion of the property of Orthodox Churches and Congregations. This accusation has been urged against the principles (as exemplified by their practices) countenanced and adopted by the body of Unitarians, with a few very honourable exceptions, and I have reason to believe, that the "naked deformity" of their conduct, so convincingly exposed

in the two letters of "Another Orthodox Dissenter," is only a specimen of the general practice of the Sect, in reference to this particular. If a general and correct list of all their Chapels and Congregations in England, could be obtained, I am of opinion, that three-fourths of them would be proved to be the property of Orthodox Christians, having been originally intended for the conducting of their worship. Who can contemplate the invasion of the Rev. MATTHEW HENRY's Chapel, at Chester, or that of the Rev. Henry NEWCOME's Chapel, at Manchester, or the present mode of disposing of Lady HEWLEY's Charity, without feeling the strongest disapprobation? Has any thing like this been detected in the recent inquires into the abuses of Charities, instituted by Mr. Brougham, with whom several of the leading Unitarians were in active co-operation? Your correspondent, "Another Orthodox Dissenter," has shown, that, previously to the year 1814, the Unitarians had not obtained, by honest purchase, one single Chapel, of all they then possessed in the whole County of Chester.

It has been asked, and properly asked, what the Unitarians mean by conduct like this? This question has long been answered by the eloquent Robert Hall; "They have met with such a rebuke of their presumption, in the total failure of their efforts, that none will contend for the reality of the divine interposition, as far as *they* are concerned; for when has the arm of the Lord been revealed to those pretended teachers of Christianity, who believe there is no such arm? We must leave them to labour in a field, respecting which God has commanded the clouds not to rain upon it. As if conscious of this, of late they have turned their efforts into a new channel, and, despairing of the conversion of sinners, have confined themselves to the seduction of the faithful; in which it must be confessed they have acted in a manner perfectly consistent with their principles; the propagation of heresy requiring, at least, no *divine* assistance." Yes, they have corrupted the faith of Orthodox Churches; in the place of which they have introduced a false and spurious Gospel; and they have invaded the sanctuaries and endow-

ments devoted by the pious dead, to the preservation and propagation of principles directly the reverse of Unitarianism. I consider these assertions to be fully borne out by the list of Chapels published for Cheshire; by which it appears that Unitarian faith and morality are preached in twelve usurped pulpits out of the whole fourteen which they occupy in that county.

I am Sir, your very obedient Servant,  
AN ORTHODOX OBSERVER.

*Manchester, 9th November, 1824.*

---

*To the Editor of the Manchester Gazette.*

“Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour’s house,”—Ex. xx, v. 17.

SIR,—I am not a regular reader of your paper, but occasionally have the opportunity of turning over your pages, and my attention has accidentally been called to some recent productions by one of your Correspondents, who styles himself “Another Orthodox Dissenter.”

It is generally thought that newspapers are not a desirable field for the display of polemical theology, and happily, owing either to the correct judgment of their Editors, or to the good sense of the public, religious bigotry is but rarely permitted to occupy their columns with its intolerant warfare. I hardly think the spirit evinced by your Correspondent will be considered by your readers such as to have justly entitled him to a dispensation from this generally received canon of newspaper law. If I understand him aright, his object is to traduce the public character of a religious denomination of Christians, whose supposed creed has, indeed, been for some years past, the frequent object of vulgar and violent abuse, and of ignorant misrepresentation, with several of the champions of self-complacent orthodoxy, but towards whose integrity of conduct, and general blamelessness of behaviour, in all that concerns their dealings with the world, the severest of their opponents have hitherto been generally disposed to bear favourable testimony. But Sir, this “Orthodox Dissenter,” in his officious and busy anxiety to

blacken the reputation of the Unitarians, lays singularly bare the nakedness of his own Christianity.—“First cast out the beam out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to cast the mote out of thy brother’s eye.”

Can any one doubt, who has read your Correspondent’s two letters, what is the impelling motive of this attack—that he secretly covets for himself, and for “*Orthodox Dissenters*” the possession of that “*respectable and venerable erection—a monument of the piety and munificence of Orthodox Dissenters of former times—Cross-street Chapel in this town.*”—When he openly charges Unitarians with having stolen from “*Orthodox Dissenters*” the places in which they, (the Unitarians,) worship, are there no secret longings in his own breast after those accompanying “endowments” which, he tells us, “exist, in some instances, to a very considerable amount?”

If the congregation which now worship in Cross-street Chapel are the intruders which your correspondent would represent, “*reaping where they have not sown,*” despoilers of another man’s vineyard, will he kindly condescend to inform us under what circumstances the felonious act took place, and where it was that the existing occupants lost their legal right to a possession which had descended to them through an uninterrupted succession of many generations? The congregation which now assemble within “*the venerable walls*” is virtually the same that worshipped there when those walls were yet fresh from the hands of the builder, and although its separate members have been called away in succession, to render an account of their stewardship, it would require more logic, I apprehend, than falls to the lot of one, or of “*Another Orthodox Dissenter*” to point out the period when the *individuality* of the congregation was ever suspended.

But, Sir, if the entertaining Unitarian sentiments is so serious a civil as well as moral transgression, as to produce what the lawyers term “*corruption of blood,*” thus rendering their professors incapable of inheriting property; and if, by virtue of a warrant of ejectment, a writ of *quo warranto*, or



a Lord Chancellor Eldon's injunction, obtained through the pious and disinterested labours of "*Orthodox Dissenters*," Cross-street Chapel should be deprived of its present justly respected, eloquent and pious minister, I must next beg of your Correspondent, again kindly to inform us who is entitled to succeed to the "*venerable edifice*?" When "*Orthodox Dissenters*" publicly charge other nonconformists with "perversion of property," in other words, with appropriating to their own use, chapels which do not belong to them, it behoves these impugners of their brethren, to shew who they are who possess a juster title to them? It may not, perhaps, be difficult to define your Correspondent's answer. These chapels, were built by "*Orthodox Dissenters*;" I am "*Another Orthodox Dissenter*," he proclaims to the world by his assumed cognomen, and he trusts there will be no difficulty in admitting what, he flatters himself, follows as a self-evident consequence from such *Orthodox* premises, that he and those of *his* church, are the lawful owners of Cross-street Chapel. How happy does he feel, by anticipation, in the enjoyment of "*those comfortable accommodations with which the Unitarian gentlemen of Manchester, (at present) find themselves surrounded every Lord's Day!*" I am well aware, Sir, what force there is in terms—how much is involved, in vulgar estimation, by a name; and with what dogmatising arrogance no inconsiderable portion of the religious world have ever been accustomed to proclaim that theirs is the true belief—to call themselves the *Orthodox*—and those who differ from them, the *Heterodox*—thus begging the point at issue, and impudently proclaiming, by the very name which they assume, that they must be in the right. The followers of Mahomet style themselves the true believers—the Romanist tells us that his is the only true church; and your Correspondent signs himself *Orthodox*, or one whose opinions are sound.

"Orthodoxy is my doxy;

"Heterodoxy is another man's doxy."

But I am not disposed to admit that your correspondent has yet made out a good title to "those comfortable Lord's-day accommodations" which he has so feelingly described. Let him explain to us in the third place, what it is that he means by his proudly vaunted "*Orthodoxy*," and we shall then be better able to form a correct judgment of his pretensions,

With respect to the other part of his communication I have little to say. The other chapels, "of the perversion" of which he complains, are, I apprehend, similarly circumstanced to Cross-street chapel. He is blameably ignorant of what he professes to explain and to sit in judgment upon, when he asserts that Lady Hewley's charity is "principally devoted to the advancement of Unitarianism."\* He calls a former correspondent of yours, under the signature of "*An Unitarian Christian*," "the friend" of the Rev. G. Harris, without the shadow of a cause for so doing, except that they both happen to avow themselves Unitarians in sentiment, and he is equally incorrect and unjust towards "*the leading Unitarians of Manchester*," when he describes them as having "lately listened with tumultuous applause [how accurately descriptive] to their favourite orator the Rev. Geo. Harris." He who considers that Rev. Gentleman as the organ of "the leading Unitarians of Manchester," knows little indeed of the history of that body of people, on whose public acts he presumes to pass his sentence of condemnation. I do not offer myself as the defender of the opinions proclaimed in that gentleman's speech, but supposing them to have been erroneous and uncandid, it strikes me that the acrimonious language they have called forth, betrays rather the *ruse de guerre* of a religious partizan, than the impartial judgment of a christian temper. However

\* It is to be regretted that Mr. Wood, who is the Treasurer of the Unitarian Colleges at York, did not explain how this assertion consists with the fact that *Six exhibitions are annually given by Lady Hewley's Trustees to young men educated in that Seminary in sentiments the very reverse of her Ladyship's*, while the applications for individual exhibitions for a similar purpose, *have been refused to Orthodox Academical Institutions.*—Editors.

virulent and severe those opinions might be, towards what their author chose to denominate "*the spirit of Orthodoxy*," he has disclaimed all intention of applying them to the *professors of Orthodox opinions* and, though the distinction when sifted, might not be very logical, there remains no evidence, at least, of *personal* hostility.

But is "*Another Orthodox Dissenter*" equally exempt from the sin of personal slander? Let your readers judge between them. I would reluctantly believe that he is as uncharitable in spirit, towards those who happen to profess a different creed from himself, as his writings would imply; but one conclusion regarding him I am compelled to come to,—that though he may be "*Orthodox*," according to his own definition of the term, he is no *Dissenter*,—he may worship within the walls of a Dissenting Meeting-house, but of the lofty spirit, and the true principles of *English Protestant Dissent*, he is indeed, lamentably ignorant.

AN ENGLISH PRESBYTERIAN.

*Rusholme, Nov. 12, 1823.*

---

*To the Editor of the Manchester Gazette.*

SIR,—That it must be exceedingly mortifying to such gentlemen as the author of the communication in your last week's paper, who styles himself "*Another Orthodox Dissenter*," to observe the progress of Unitarianism, cannot for a moment be doubted. Truth and Error never were, and never will be friends—they must despise and hate each other. Nor is it to be wondered, when we consider the spirit which *Trinitarian Orthodoxy* has often displayed, that your Correspondent should be filled with regret when he sees that Unitarians are able, by any means, to obtain "their daily bread." Much more gratifying would it, doubtless, have been to him, had they never existed, or, if created, had they merely lived

---

"to gaze on heaven,  
To breathe, and to expire."

Least of all, can he bear the idea that *Unitarianism* should reap any benefit from *reputed Orthodoxy*. But thus it is; and, instead of looking to futurity for consolation, and hoping that things will be better soon, it is to be apprehended that, what he laments as one of the greatest evils under the sun, is every day becoming greater and still greater.

Whether “Another Orthodox Dissenter” be correct or not in his brief, but to himself painfully expressive notes upon all the Unitarian Chapels which he has mentioned in your last paper, I am unable to state; but it is true enough that *Dukinfield Old Chapel*, as it is generally called, is in the hands of a numerous and highly respectable congregation of Unitarians. The Chapel was originally built upon *leasehold* property, and, after the expiration of a certain number of years, it reverted to the late John Astley, Esq. Lord of the Manor of Dukinfield. By him it was also leased once or twice to the congregation for a short term of years; and it is not long since Francis Dukinfield Astley, Esq. with a liberality which *reputed Orthodoxy* would doubtless consider most egregiously misplaced, conveyed it over to trustees *for ever*, for the purposes to which it is now devoted. Perhaps, however, this is a representation of the case which will not serve your Correspondent’s purposes. Be this as it may, he can tell you, Sir, that “it is but too true.”

A NONCONFORMIST.

Nov. 10, 1824.

---

*To the Editor of the Manchester Gazette.*

SIR,—I noticed in your last number a letter signed “*An English Presbyterian*.” With the contents of that letter, I do not mean to intermeddle; the subject appears to be in proper hands, and to them I leave it. The occasion of my present communication is solely the signature, which its writer has assumed.

Who are these English Presbyterians to whom this writer belongs? I know of no religious body of that denomination. That there were in this country, perhaps a century ago, a considerable body of English Presbyterians,

your readers do not require to be informed. Nor need it be stated, that the bulk of modern Unitarians are their descendants. It is not, however, so generally known, that these English Presbyterians ceased virtually to be Presbyterians, long before they changed either their creed or their name. And even this circumstance, I presume, requires no proof from those at all acquainted with their history.

That this "English Presbyterian" is a professing Unitarian, is pretty unequivocally told us, by the tenor of his communication. But what claim has an Unitarian to that title? Presbyterianism is simply a system of ecclesiastical government. Unitarians, may, as well as any others, adopt that system, and then they have a right to the name. But I cannot learn that this is the case. As far as my information extends, they have no Presbyteries—their congregations are not under the controul of courts of review of my name; nor is one single distinguishing principle of Presbyterianism carried into operation by them. It is not sufficient to establish their title to the name, that the majority of the Chapels they now occupy were built by the Presbyterians, and that they are their descendants. In these matters, I am not disposed to carry courtesy so far, as to allow names to be hereditary, to the violation of every law of common sense and common consistency.

Some people may consider this a matter of no moment; as taking umbrage at a mere word. But, Sir, it is far from being a mere logomachy. I agree with your Correspondent, the propriety of whose "assumed cognomen" I now dispute, that there is "a considerable force in terms, that much is involved in vulgar estimation by (in) a name." And I suspect that to the force of terms, and the vulgar estimation of a name, and to men not distinguishing betwixt names and things, Unitarianism has been not a little indebted for a very considerable proportion of its members. No doubt, it obtained its principal entrance through the injudicious endowments of well-meaning Presbyterians and the subsequent silence of their *nominal* successors on those *orthodox prin-*

*ciples*—the belief and influence of which made the first English Presbyterians so pre-eminent for elevation and sanctity of character ; and so pre-eminent also in embodying the “ lofty spirit and true principles of *English Protestant Dissent*.” But its introduction was aided greatly by coming forward under the Presbyterian name. Numbers of careless people (and there have always been numbers of this description in every denomination) would never dream, that while they were retaining their former designation, they were getting palmed upon them a new and opposite religious system. Even at the present day, it is not uncommon to hear the terms Presbyterian and Unitarian used interchangeably. The mistake, in fact, in certain quarters, is prevalent, of confounding modern Unitarians with existing religious bodies, who actually are Presbyterians, and whose principles are the antipodes of those of Unitarianism.

It has been the observation of this mistake, and a wish to expose it, which indeed have principally prompted this communication. Every system, I conceive, ought to have its appropriate name, and ought to stand on its own merits. In this sentiment, I question not, I have the concurrence of your Correspondent ; whom, as an individual, I do not mean to charge with a design of making advances, under colours not his own. He adopted his present “cognomen” probably, without hesitation ;—without even bestowing on the matter so much thought as he has bestowed on those “ assumed cognomens” he seems so much to dislike, and that appears to have been very little. But however this may be, I do maintain that in this country, real Presbyterianism never formed any alliance with Unitarianism, and that Unitarians are not Presbyterians. And as a professing Presbyterian, I hope I am justified in disclaiming all connection with your Correspondent, and the body to which he appears to belong ; and I call upon him to desist from the assumption of his present title, till he belongs to a body which possesses a tenable claim to it.

A SCOTCH PRESBYTERIAN.

Nov. 17, 1824.

*To the Editor of the Manchester Gazette.*

“*Thou shalt not steal.*”—Ex. xx. 15.

Sir,—Alarming intelligence, respecting the vast preparations of the Unitarians to answer my former letters, reached me some days ago, like the hollow, distant murmurs of an approaching storm. Two productions have now appeared—the accredited document, signed “An English Presbyterian,” and the auxiliary contribution of “A Non-conformist.” I find these, as Dr. Johnson said, to be “not of more than mortal might,” though the latter is certainly the better of the two. Yet, I suppose, in point of “lofty” dignity and official importance, the letter of “An English Presbyterian” will claim my principal attention, while the lucky Non-con must be content, if a passing remark or two be all the attention that I can bestow upon him. Amidst the fumes, therefore, which these gentlemen have raised, I calmly sit down to my task.

The “English Presbyterian” has evidently employed what ingenuity he possesses in endeavouring to divert the attention of the public from the real points at issue. Yet, that he may not say he is unanswered, I shall wait upon him a little in his lordly flights—He commences by declaiming, in “lofty” style, against the introduction of “polemical theology” into the newspapers. But pray, by whom was “theology” *first* introduced into the newspapers, in the present instance? Who inserted in the newspapers that mighty article of “polemical theology,” the speech of the Reverend George Harris? Who introduced the touching death-bed scenes, first to the jovial, laughing, shouting gentlemen at the Spread Eagle, and afterwards into the newspapers? Who favoured the public, through the same medium, with the speech of the worthy Chairman, in which that gentleman is so “much” and tenderly “affected,” that he breaks out into sneers at his neighbours, the “evangelical preachers?” To the practice of his own people (for several of the speeches bear internal evidence of having been furnished by the

speakers,) at the commencement of this discussion, the objection of my adversary may possibly apply ; but the case is now different. The matter has taken such a turn, that it is no longer a theological subject, but a question relating to **PROPERTY**, which may be as fitly discussed in the newspapers, as the public accounts of the town of Manchester.

The tirade upon my use of the terms "orthodox" and "orthodoxy," has I confess, somewhat astonished me. Really, these Unitarians will try my patience after all, for I can neither *do*, nor *say* as they *do* or *say*, but they are offended with me. Were not these the very terms, by which they, themselves, chose to designate us in the commencement of this business, both at their ever-memorable meeting, and afterwards in the newspapers ? To accept such terms at their hands, after all the reproach which had been poured upon them by the Reverend Mr. H., and which Unitarians are in the habit of pouring, I felt to require an act of self-denial, rather than to foster all that pride which they charge upon me. When, therefore, my opponent tauntingly asks me to define "Orthodoxy," I reply, "Define your own term, Sir, or, at any rate, that of your party ; and, while your hand is in, have the goodness, too, to give us a definition of Unitarians." "I am not a regular reader of" Unitarian publications, "but occasionally I have the opportunity of "turning over" their "pages," and this I can testify, that, amidst the opposite and discordant opinions of that people among themselves, upon almost every subject that can be mentioned, it would puzzle a college of archangels to tell what Unitarianism is. But it is mere quibbling of my opponent to ask for a definition ; what are the leading points in which we differ from them, is well-known to every body.

It is a curious fact, that by adopting the vocabulary which the Unitarians had supplied, I have incurred the censure of both friends and foes. Some friends have objected to my applying the term "Unitarian" to this people, which they think, has the appearance of conceding a point in dispute. I have replied, that I thought both the word "Or-



thodox" and "Unitarian," were generally understood to be mere terms of convenience, and have persisted in my course. My friends will now tell me that I am rightly served, and I shall bow to the reproof; only remarking, that I really did think Unitarians had taken a more liberal and enlarged view of things, than now appears to be the case.

The term "Orthodox" I will give up, whenever the Socinians will consent to use one equally convenient; but I really cannot so easily part with that of "Dissenter." It was cruel, therefore, in the "English Presbyterian," to divest me of this, while he left me to guess in the dark, at his reason for such an injurious proceeding.—Is it because I maintain, that property set apart for one purpose, ought not to be devoted to another which is directly contrary? To show that this is the true state of the case between us, I appeal to the words of even one of my new opponents, who ranges the Socinians and us, respectively on the the sides of "truth and error," which "never were, and never will be friends," but "must despise and hate each other." What, I ask, can be more contrary than "truth and error," which are thus engaged in eternal warfare? Now I take their own statement, and I ask, "Is it just to apply property left for one purpose to another which is so directly the contrary of it? Or do I forfeit my claim to the name of "Dissenter," by holding the contrary of such a diabolical principle? If I do, then let the name go, and give me, in the place of it, any other that can be found in any language spoken on the face of the earth.

Let me ask again, was Mr. Belsham "lamentably ignorant of the true principles of *English Protestant Dissent*," when, upon embracing Socinian sentiments, he resigned his situation, as principal of the Academy at Daventry, because he was "*no longer able to fulfil the design of his situation*," which was inseparably connected with the advancement of Orthodox principles? Of whatever else he might be ignorant, he seems to me, and to many, to have understood, in that instance, what were the "lofty" principles of an honest

man, and this was the boast of the Socinians, at that time. And were the *thirteen* Unitarian ministers, who, not long since, signed the case of the chapel at Wolverhampton, “lamentably ignorant” of Dissenting principles, when they vainly endeavoured to prove that the endowments belonging to that chapel, were left at a period when it had an Unitarian ministry? Why did they endeavour to avail themselves of the principle upon which I am insisting, if it is not just and sound?

The fact is, Sir, the Unitarians would be glad to avail themselves of it, in every instance, if it would serve their purpose. Of this we have a remarkable proof in the course adopted by your present Correspondent, “A Non-conformist.” That gentleman understood me to call in question the right of the Unitarians to hold the chapels and endowments founded by Orthodox Christians; and how does he defend their supposed right? Does he produce any principle which will meet my argument in its general bearings? No, not a word of this; he is evidently glad to escape from such a task. He leaves the other chapels to shift for themselves, and avails himself of a recent and uncommon occurrence, to place that with which he happens to be connected out of the reach of my argument. He tells you, Sir, that the “Dukinfield Old Chapel” had become private property, and that the gentleman to whom it belonged, has given it to the present Unitarian congregation. If so, most unquestionable it is theirs; but the endowment of Mr. James Heywood, certainly is not theirs. Now, Sir, mark: This gentleman is so eager to advance a better argument than the Unitarians in general are possessed of, in defence of this right to the Dukinfield Chapel, that he actually forgets the Dukinfield endowment, which stood in need of a similar vindication. And thus glad would all of them be to lay hold of any tenable principle, which would serve their turn.

Very different, however, from the task of his Dukinfield brother, is that of “An English Presbyterian.” No fortunate event, of later years, has lessened his toil. His unmitigated

task, according to their own statement, is, to prove that the property of "*truth*" belongs to "*error*," and that of "*error*" to "*truth*." And that we may not be bewildered with merely abstract principles, he chooses Cross-street Chapel, Manchester, as the tangible object of his defence. "The other chapels," he says, "are similarly circumstanced to Cross-street Chapel;" but whether he makes this remark to involve them in the same condemnation, or to give them the benefit of his logic, I am unable to divine.

This gentleman is very metaphysical, and his first argument is, "the *individuality* of the congregation" at Cross-street Chapel; it is "virtually," he contends, "the same that always worshipped there;" and he demands to know, "when this individuality was ever suspended." There are the persons in Manchester who can tell him "when this individuality was suspended," having heard from their hoary ancestors and relatives, some of whom are but recently departed, how they found themselves obliged to leave Cross-street Chapel, when Socinian principles were first distinctly advanced from its pulpit. At that period the congregation was a *duality*, and not an "individuality." There has been a similar period in the case of, perhaps, every chapel "similarly circumstanced" to that at Cross-street. In these cases, the question, then, is, to which individual, of this *dual* number, the Trinitarian or the Socinian, did the chapel belong?

There would have been no difficulty in determining this matter, if a just and righteous umpire must always have been chosen, and I consider it a proof of "the direful and demoralizing effects" of Socinianism, that this method was not adopted. But, instead of it, the influence of a minister, of the rich, or downright violence (as in the case at Wolverhampton,) prevails; the Orthodox were obliged to provide for themselves; and thus, perhaps, hundreds of the present Independent Chapels had their origin. Where a chapel could not be obtained, a barn was set apart, or the poor, heart-broken Trinitarians, sought a refuge among the Methodists, or in the Establishment, and thus multitudes have

been lost for ever to the cause of non-conformity. The zealous members of the Establishment know how to avail themselves of this circumstance, and are now availing themselves of it, as some of the periodical publications of this very month, sufficiently evince.

It was, I doubt not, to keep this curious doctrine of "individuality" in countenance that the signature of "An English Presbyterian," was chosen by your correspondent, though the discipline, as well as the doctrine, of the Presbyterians, is entirely renounced by his denomination. He is "well aware," he tells us, "what force there is in terms," and "force," indeed, there must be in them, if they can give a title to a chapel. This is just as if some one were to turn the Manchester Infirmary into a theatre, and preserve the original name as a title-deed for the players.

To please this gentleman, if possible, I have taken this notice of his doctrine of "individuality," though, it has, in fact, nothing whatever to do with the question at issue. *Trust* property is not left to *persons* to do what they *please* with it, but for *purposes* which are to be *promoted* by it; and when persons cannot, or will not, devote it to those purposes, they ought, in common honesty, to relinquish all connexion with it. They are still at perfect liberty to lay out their property in building chapels, or in whatever else they please.

The next question which my adversary puts to me (under the supposition that Cross-street Chapel does not belong to the Unitarians,) is, "Who is entitled to succeed to the *venerable edifice*?" Before I can answer this, I must have the original title-deeds submitted to me for inspection? My opponent forgets himself; I am not a Unitarian; I cannot decide without the proper documents, much less in the face of them, as they do. It is true, *I know*, that the title-deeds of some chapels in their possession, at no great distance from Manchester, are, or *were*, drawn up with provisions, which were directly intended to keep those chapels out of such hands as theirs. Let me, then, duly inspect the "venerable" parchments, and, if it should turn out that

Henry Newcome and his friends purchased and set apart the premises at Cross-street for Unitarian purposes, I shall certainly decide in favour of the "English Presbyterian" and his connexions; but, unfortunately for them, I am given to understand that directly the reverse is the case. However, I shall not disinherit them on account of any heretical "*corruption of blood*," neither shall I allow that their "*blood*" is so excellent as to entitle them to other men's property. If I can find no legal claimant, I shall assign the premises to the Crown, to which unclaimed property belongs; so the Unitarians need not fear lest there should be no owner. But I can do nothing without the deeds. Unitarians, I know, can; and the wonder with me is, how they ever happen to think of making deeds. Human nature is not so constituted that it is necessary to have trust deeds to oblige men to follow their own will and pleasure. My opponent's third question I have already answered.

As he is so dissatisfied with Lord Eldon, as a Chancellor, I have endeavoured to do my best for him, in the high office to which he has elected me. Perhaps, however, he had better have kept to his Lordship, since that noble person cannot be supposed to indulge any of those covetous, "secret longings," which our advocate for decorum has ascribed to me. For any thing that appears, his Lordship loves the Unitarians as well as us, and us as well as them. I am no admirer of his party politics, but his warmest political opponents allow him to possess incomparable qualifications for his office, and to be most scrupulously conscientious in discharging its duties. If the Unitarians kept their own consciences as faithfully as he keeps the King's, they would never finger another shilling left by Orthodox Christians. But he has offended them, it seems, by a decision, in which he is supported by all impartial men, and, among the rest (as appears from documents before us,) by Lord Chancellor Camden, whose liberal opinions gratified even such a writer as Junius. It was cruel, to be sure, that Lord Eldon's injunction should have prevented a posse of fier-

Unitarians from worrying a poor minister, who had renounced their sentiments, in a chapel built by the Orthodox, and from which it is confessed, an Orthodox *majority*, with the minister of their choice, had, in the memory of many persons living, been *forcibly* shut out by a Unitarian *minority*, and driven to worship their Maker in a barn. Your correspondent may gnash his teeth at this, but his Lordship will go on in the due execution of his office, which, I find, from the law authorities, is to give relief against “all frauds and deceits—*all breaches of trust and of confidence,*” &c. &c.

Let the Unitarians, however, not be alarmed; we believe they have no right to the chapels and endowments in question, but we have no present designs upon them. If they had just been decent in their treatment of the principles to which they are so much indebted, this discussion would never have occurred. They may compose their nerves, and enjoy their “daily bread.” They seem to be aware that it is much easier to eat it, than to defend it, and, therefore, neither of my opponents has said a word to justify their use or rather their abuse, of the “funds and endowments.” Those “perversions of property,” to the amount of thousands annually, in the northern counties of England alone, they know full well they cannot vindicate to the satisfaction of any impartial and reasonable man.

I remain, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

ANOTHER ORTHODOX DISSENTER.

Nov. 20, 1824.

---

P. S. The “English Presbyterian” has, in appearance, contradicted me in reference to Lady Hewley’s charity, but has taken care not to do so in reality. Perhaps I shall have to request a place in your paper at a future time, for a display of my *blameable ignorance* of that pious lady’s posthumous affairs.

*To the Editor of the Manchester Gazette.*

SIR;—I am much mistaken if the controversy on religious matters, which you have invited to your columns, does not, before it terminates, afford some proof of the truth of my remark, that such topics are unsuited to newspaper discussion. Supposing them to excite a temporary interest, they can scarcely ever be handled to good purpose under the disadvantage of hasty publication, and of scanty limits; and they too frequently serve to inflame some of the worst feelings of the human heart.

It is not in newspapers that the religious man studies the evidences of his holy faith, or searches for incentives to a life of purity and truth, whilst the fierce polemic and intolerant bigot eagerly embraces such a cheap and ready mode of attracting notice to himself, and of pouring forth his anathemas against those who worship their creator under forms different from his own. If indeed you could always ensure for your readers that spirit of candour and of a truly Christian temper which characterized the two letters that first appeared on this occasion, under the signatures of "*An Orthodox Dissenter*," and "*An Unitarian Christian*," we might tolerate, and perhaps receive benefit from the occasional discussion of such subjects—but of the pernicious tendency of newspaper polemics, even when the religious warfare has begun under such gentle and courteous leaders as those to whom I have alluded, the columns of your last week's paper afford melancholy testimony.

But, Sir, the jealous and sectarian spirit evinced by "*Another Orthodox Dissenter*," would have passed without a comment from me had he confined it to encomiums on his own "*Orthodoxy*" or denunciations on "*the direful and demoralizing effects of Socinianism*."

"For modes of faith let graceless zealots fight,  
His can't be wrong whose life is in the right."

There is nothing in the tone and temper of his writings—in the decorum of his language—in the correctness of his

statements—or in the strength of his argument—that could make any one desirous of engaging in controversy with him: but when an unfounded and vindictive attack is publicly made on the character and conduct of a religious community whose members hold no unimportant station in society, and enjoy their fair share of the confidence and esteem of their fellow men—when they are openly charged with theft—(“Thou shalt not steal,”)—with “perversions of property to the amount of thousands annually,”—it is necessary that the calumny should not pass uncontradicted even though it be disseminated under the timid guise of an anonymous signature. It was therefore from a sense of public duty, that I reluctantly quitted occupations of a pleasanter character, to notice the letters under the signature of “Another Orthodox Dissenter.”

I have searched in vain, in his letter of the 20th, for a valid argument in support of the charge which he had made, or a satisfactory answer to the queries, which I took the liberty of proposing, for the purpose of elucidating the facts on which I presumed he would endeavour to rest his vindication. Your Correspondent says, that I chose Cross-street Chapel, Manchester, as the tangible object of my defence—but in this he displays rather the art of the disputant, than the proceeding of an impartial investigator of truth. He would wish it to be inferred, that, out of a number of cases, cited by him, of alleged malversation, I had selected this one for defence, as most favourable for my purpose—but it was not I who chose Cross-street Chapel as the object of defence, but he who made it the chosen subject of his attack. When, therefore, he charged the respectable congregation of Cross-street with having “perverted” from its rightful owners the Chapel in which it assembles for religious worship, I called on him for the evidence on which he made the assertion. I asked, in the first place, at what period the alleged “perversion” had taken place—when it was that the existing occupants had lost their legal right to a possession which had descended to them through an uninterrupted succession of many generations; secondly, who



were the parties who enjoyed a juster title to the property ; and thirdly, in what sense he used the term "*Orthodox*," on the magical influence of which word rested the only shew of evidence that the property had been "perverted" at all.

Of the relevancy of these queries every one must, I think, see the force. He who impugns the conduct of another, by charging him with an overt act of an immoral nature, is bound to substantiate his allegation. If property has been "perverted" from its rightful owners, the fact must have occurred at some definite period, and the superior title of the rival claimants must be established before the act of restitution can take place. It was fitting, therefore, that he who challenged the property should be prepared to answer these, or similar enquiries. Let us see in what spirit he has met the call.

To my first enquiry he has returned no specific answer.

He informs you, indeed, that "there are the persons in Manchester" who can tell me when the "individuality" of the congregation was suspended, "having heard from their hoary ancestors and relatives, some of whom are but recently departed, how they found themselves obliged to leave Cross-street Chapel, when Socinian principles were first distinctly advanced from its pulpit,"—A vague reference to nameless persons, for information concerning a tradition, in relation to which neither names nor dates are given, is not very satisfactory testimony, but in the absence of better we must make the most of it. If "hoary ancestors and relatives" were obliged to leave the chapel on account of the doctrine that was preached there, I apprehend, from the circumstance of their retiring, that they formed only a minority of the congregation, and, according to the custom of Dissenting Societies, and the true principles of Protestant Dissent, whenever a diversity of opinion has arisen among their members which could not be reconciled—whether proceeding from questions of doctrine—of discipline—or regarding the choice of a Minister, that the minority have yielded to the decision of the majority, and withdrawn to

form for themselves a separate Church\*—" And Abram said to Lot, Let there be no strife, I pray thee, between me and thee, for we are kinsman. Separate thyself, I pray thee, from me." Such cases are by no means confined to *Presbyterian* congregations, nor has it always been the self-styled Orthodox who have retired, as the Dissenting Annals of this, and the neighbouring counties, will testify.

To my second enquiry your correspondent says, " Before I can answer this, I must have the original title-deeds submitted to me for inspection. My opponent forgets himself; I am not an Unitarian; I cannot decide without the proper documents, much less in the face of them, as they do. It is true, *I know*, that the title-deeds of some chapels in their possession, at no great distance from Manchester, are, or *were*, drawn up with provisions, which were directly intended to keep those chapels out of such hands as theirs. Let me, then, duly inspect the "venerable parchments,"—and if it should turn out that Henry Newcome and his friends purchased and set apart the premises in Cross-street for Unitarian purposes, I shall certainly decide in favour of the "English Presbyterian" and his connexions; but unfortunately for them, I am given to understand, that directly the reverse is the case. But I can do nothing without the deeds"—"Unitarians I know can; and the wonder with me is, how they ever happen to think of making deeds. Human nature is not so constituted that it is necessary to have trust-deeds to oblige men to follow their own will and pleasure."

The gross invective of the foregoing passage I pass over. Let us examine, for a moment his argument. Its author had charged a religious society with the crime of appropriating to themselves a chapel, and large endowments, which are the property of others.—When asked who are the parties

\* The fact is, that in most instances the *majority* of the worshippers who were Orthodox, yielded to the necessity of departing either at once or gradually, because the *few* who being *Trustees*, appointed the Minister, and had the power of the funds, forced upon them Socinian Teachers. Abraham gave to Lot the choice of extensive fertile and well watered plains: but these Trustees said to those whom they unjustly expelled, "we shall retain the Chapels and the Funds, and you may shift for yourselves."—*Editors*.

thus defrauded, he says *to the Society itself*.—"My charges against you are questioned—afford me the means of establishing them—inform me whether my impeachment of your honesty has any just foundation ;—if I find that my imputations are unfounded, though I am your accuser, as well as your Judge, I shall certainly decide in your favour." —But we must not over estimate his measure of justice : we must further be prepared, he tells us, to shew that "Henry Newcome and his friends, set apart premises for Unitarian purposes," or judgment will go against us, and he intimates, pretty plainly, what, after all, he fears must be our fate. "*Unfortunately for them,*" he adds, "*I have been given to understand the reverse is the case.*"

What if Henry Newcome should have made no provision whatsoever for Unitarianism, or any other *ism*—if he should have wisely avoided attempting to impose fetters on the human mind, or stay the progress of religious truth,—but duly appreciating the liberty with which Christ had made him free, should have been contented to leave those who were to follow him free, to obey the convictions of their own minds—to form their creed, not by the authority of Church or State, but by the light of their own religious enquiries, and the honest dictates of conscience ?

To my third enquiry your correspondent answers as follows :—"I reply, define your own term, Sir, or at any rate that of your party ; and, while your hand is in, have the goodness too to give us a definition of Unitarians. I am not a regular reader of Unitarian publications, but occasionally I have the opportunity of turning over their pages, and this I can testify, that amidst the opposite and discordant opinions of that people among themselves, upon almost every subject that can be mentioned, it would puzzle a College of archangels to tell what Unitarianism is. But it is mere quibbling of my opponent to ask for a definition ; what are the leading points in which we differ from them, is well known to every body."

I have now gone through your correspondent's replies to my three queries ; and I would ask, is it indeed thus, that one, who boasts of being a Protestant Dissenter, can con-

tent himself to write, when called upon to substantiate his charge against a respectable body of his Dissenting brethren. Asked for his proofs, he can banter—he can sneer—he can fly off to make other accusations, each as vague and as defamatory as the first. With singular assurance, he allows that he can substantiate nothing—“*I can do nothing without the deeds.*”—“*Let me then duly inspect the venerable parchments.*” Those deeds, be it observed, the deliberate violation of which forms the gravamen of his accusation. Deeds which he openly insinuates that Unitarians can fraudulently conceal,\* and wilfully falsify,† and which he next declares, are not at all necessary to them! The common place subterfuge of dealers in scandal “*I am given to understand,*” is all that he alleges in support of his criminatory charge. I am wholly ignorant who your correspondent is—how far the publisher of a public print is justifiable in giving currency to calumnies such as these, on anonymous, and therefore irresponsible authority, I shall not enquire;—but if their author possesses any sense of moral justice, he will not hesitate to avow his name,‡ that the odium due to such conduct, may not, even by conjecture, be imputed to those who are innocent of it.

Of other objects for comment your correspondent's letter affords abundant materials; but I flatter myself, after the observations I have already made, that it is as unnecessary as it would be irksome, to pursue him through his minor inaccuracies. The jet of the question lies in a narrow compass.

There is an amusing, and a clever work, recently published—“*The Book of Fallacies*” which every one should read before he appears as a controversialist. The term

\* Vide “LANCASTER,” in his list.

† Vide quotation above.

‡ The reason for requiring this avowal is obvious. The Controversy had reached its crisis; but the endeavour to overawe and silence the advocates of the inviolability of Trust Deeds, did not succeed.—*Editors.*

*Orthodox* is one of these fallacies, and the terms *Socinian* and *Unitarian* (as your correspondent uses them) are fallacies also.—It is by the dextrous use of words, of big import, but of vague and arbitrary meaning, as weapons of attack and defence, that the skilful debater, who fights for victory, and not for truth, throws dust into the eyes of his unsuspecting hearers ; and it is by a dextrous juggle between these two cabalistic words *Orthodoxy* and *Unitarian*, that your correspondent has contrived to embarrass a very plain case, in the appearance of a contradiction. He gives a list of what he is pleased to call “*Unitarian Chapels*” opposite to which he tells us that 37 out of 45 were ‘*originally Orthodox*’ from which he infers, that the Unitarians have *stolen* these chapels from the Orthodox ; and thus, on two assertions and one inference, he rests his case as proved. Now these Chapels are *English Presbyterian Chapels*. They were built by the English Presbyterians, soon after the passing of the Act of Toleration, and have continued in the uninterrupted possession of that denomination of Protestant Dissenters, from that time to the present day. During the space of nearly a century and a half their pulpits have been filled by a succession of Ministers, regularly appointed, by the *call* or election of a majority of the congregation, according to the established usage of English Protestant Dissenters ; and the worshippers within them are, in a great degree, lineal descendants of those by whom the places were founded, or of those who were early associated with them in membership. It was as a member of this religious denomination, that I adopted the signature of “An English Presbyterian.” Descended from Ancestors who have borne that honourable appellation from the earliest infancy of Protestant Nonconformity ; educated among the English Presbyterians, and by the blessing of God, destined I hope, to spend the remainder of my days in connexion with them. I could not have supposed that the name I assumed, could be objected to ;—but I wish to practise no deception, and I therefore now avow myself the author of the letter signed

“An English Presbyterian” in your paper of the 13th inst. and subscribe myself, with much regard,

Sir, your obliged and obedient humble Servant,

GEO. WM. WOOD.

Nov. 27, 1824.

P. S. To your other correspondent, my Presbyterian brother on the other side of the Tweed, I can only express my thanks, which I do with much sincerity, for the candid and gentlemanly character of his letter, (*O si sic omnia!*) referring him briefly, to the Ecclesiastical History of England during the eighteenth century.

G. W. W.

---

*To the Editor of the Manchester Gazette.*

SIR,—Theological discussions are not, I have always thought, fit subjects for the columns of a Newspaper. The controversy which has existed in your paper for some weeks would not have engaged my attention if it had been confined merely to doctrinal points.

A Correspondent, however, of yours who has adopted the signature of “*Another Orthodox Dissenter*,” has with great self-complacency amused himself and endeavoured to amuse your readers with a pompous display of the encroachments and usurpations committed by that body of Dissenters who are of late entitled “Unitarians,” but who, for the most part, are the genuine representatives of the English Presbyterians, one of the three great divisions of Protestant Dissenters who are known and acknowledged in history as subsisting in this kingdom ever since the Toleration Act.

Your Correspondent says, “it is no longer a theological subject, but a question relating to *property*; which may be as fitly discussed in the newspapers as the public accounts of the town of Manchester.

Sir, I fully agree with your correspondent; the question is not theological, but one of property. Your correspondent insinuates pretty broadly, (that among a variety of other congregations whom he enumerates) the Presbyterian congre-

gation of Cross-street Chapel (for that is the only distinctive appellation which the trusts of the Chapel recognise) appropriate to themselves *Endowments* to which they have no right; and another of your correspondents "*An Orthodox Observer*," in still more impassioned terms, cries out against this appropriation as an abuse worse than any of those detected by Mr. Brougham in his late investigation of the Public Charities of the kingdom.

Now Sir, I really compassionate both of your zealous correspondents.—The legal maxim is "Ignorance of the law is no excuse." What must an impartial public think, Sir, of your correspondents, who literally and truly, as far as the Cross-street Chapel is concerned, know nothing at all about the matter; and yet they make a charge against a large and respectable body of Dissenters affecting in direct terms their moral integrity; a charge which, if proved to be true against any private individual, would be sufficient to banish him from society for ever.

Sir, an ancestor of my own was one of the original founders of Cross-street Chapel. Our family have been members of the congregation—associates in the divine worship and services—administered therein from its first erection to the present time.

In the course of the last century undoubtedly a great change has taken place in the opinions of English Presbyterians in general. The late pious Mr. Mottershead **FOUND HIS CONGREGATION ABOUT NINETY YEARS AGO RIGID CALVINISTS**; having been uniformly influenced by a spirit of calm inquiry and Christian candour, he **LEFT THEM AT HIS DECEASE**, after a ministry of nearly fifty years, **ARMINIANS and ARIANS**. His colleague, Mr. S. Seddon, was the first to speak in our Chapel what were then called Socinian Doctrines; but it **DOES NOT APPEAR THAT MANY, CERTAINLY NOT THE GREATER PART OF HIS HEARERS CONCURRED WITH HIM IN OPINION.\***

\* This is a complete admission of the truth of 'Another Orthodox Dissenter's' statements and the force of his argument; and this admission is made by a gentleman, who is himself a Trustee—who is the law agent of the others,—and the keeper of the Trust Deeds,—*Editors*.

Of late years, a spirit of enquiry and more extended researches into the Holy Scriptures and the writers of Ecclesiastical Antiquity, have largely promoted what are called the Socinian or Unitarian Doctrines, particularly in our "Presbyterian" congregation.

If a "Presbyterian" did not cease to be so when preferring the opinions of Arius and Arminius to those of Calvin, I do not see how by adopting the opinions of Socinus he could forfeit his right to be designated a Presbyterian, in which class of Dissenters he had been born and educated.

The question may now occur—what is the inference from all this?—I will refer you, Sir, to the highest authority.

The Legislature itself, from the Act of Toleration in King William's time, to the late Act for repealing the penalties on those who impugn the doctrine of the Trinity, has to its honour, recognised the sacred rights of private judgment, and declared all those who acknowledge the sufficiency of the Scriptures for the guidance and rule of Christians, to be entitled to the privileges of British subjects equally with those who worship within the pale of the Established Church itself. An exception must, however, be made with respect to the operation of the Corporation and Test Acts, which it is not relevant to mention further.

To revert, however, to the Cross-street Chapel, I am anxious to allay the fears, and ease the doubts of your Correspondent, "Another Orthodox Dissenter." He says the *Endowment* is ample. I tell him, he says the thing which is not, in the sense in which he wishes your readers to understand him, namely, that the Endowment is of Orthodox creation. Cross Street Chapel has no Endowment at all coeval with its foundation, nor has it any auxiliary funds but such as owe their origin to some of the present generation of its members. The rents of the pews of the Chapel form "*the ample Endowment*," of which the jealousies of both your Correspondents would make the public believe that the present congregation are defrauding the representatives of the Orthodox founders of the Chapel who died a century ago.

Truly, Sir, we are greatly obliged by the commiseration



of your Correspondent, "Another Orthodox Dissenter." He bids us not to be alarmed, but to "compose our nerves," and "enjoy our daily bread." I, for one, thank him (as the beggar did the friar when offered his blessing) for nothing at all. Let your Correspondents take comfort, they have the means of redress.

If we have usurped the property of the representatives of our Orthodox ancestors, I entreat that your Correspondents will indulge their zeal in getting an information filed against us by His Majesty's Attorney-General to redress the wrong. Our congregation will meet them without fear.

In the mean time, I recommend both your Correspondents to temper the *odium theologicum*, which they manifest with a little more Christian charity towards others, who conscientiously differ from them in opinion; and to be hereafter more cautious in imputing to whole bodies of their fellow Christians a violation of the precepts of common honesty and integrity, merely because they use the privilege which the law gives them of worshipping God in the way they like best.

I am, Sir, yours' &c.

SAMUEL KAY.

Manchester, Nov. 24, 1824.

---

*To the Editor of the Manchester Gazette.*

SIR,—It cannot be determined how far you are justly chargeable with having "invited to your columns" the existing controversy, until it is distinctly known whether the publishing of the proceedings by which it was occasioned, originated with yourself, or was the result of the solicitation of others. It is impossible, however, in either case, for the authors of that publication, to evade the whole responsibility of a contest to which they thus gave both the signal and the commencement. Although I have latterly taken no part in this discussion, I now feel it my duty, as your first correspondent on the subject, to assert, that the appearance of my letter in your paper was the result of my own application,

and that I applied to you for that purpose, on the ground of your impartiality as a public Journalist, because your paper contained what I cannot cease to denominate an unjust and opprobrious attack upon sentiments which have my cordial belief and attachment. Indeed this was so inexcusable an aggression, on the part of the Unitarians, and they threw down the gauntlet with such an air of defiance and of triumph, that it ill becomes them, though smarting from the blows which they have provoked, to express either surprise or complaint.

Had they been content to celebrate a feast of friendship—or had they merely yielded to the additional indulgence of mutual congratulation on the excellency of their creed—or even if their gratification had been incomplete without a few words in disparagement of the Orthodox, still all would have been well, had their prudence confined the ebullitions of the evening to their own walls: but having given them to the world, it is difficult to conceive how they could expect to pass, I will not say unchastised, but unrebuked. Will they plead that their accusation was conceived in language so moderate, that it bore such marks of candour and liberality—and that it was so divested of acrimony and spleen, as necessarily to disarm resentment, and render it impossible to take just offence? On the contrary, it conveys the most unmeasured obloquy and contempt, and, though comprised in a few lines, it almost exhausts the vocabulary of invective and reproach.

It is inconceivable that they will adopt the plea of insignificance, and urge that their sentiments are not to be understood as characteristic of the Manchester Unitarians: for surely the presence of one hundred and twenty gentlemen of that persuasion, men of great respectability in the town, and the company of their own ministers, men likewise of the first reputation among them, must give to those proceedings all the sanction of the Unitarian body. But the objectionable expressions fell from the lips of Mr. Harris;—did Mr. Harris then drop from the clouds amongst them:—did he appear without an invitation, and remain without a welcome? Were all the Unitarian Ministers residing within a certain

distance of Manchester, summoned to the banquet, or was that favour reserved for Mr. Harris alone? Were we ignorant of the personal character of the parties concerned, we should be ready to imagine, that, like Balak, panic struck at the number, valour and achievements of the Israelitish army, they had sent to another town for a prophet, saying, with the King of Moab, "Come curse me Jacob, and come defy Israel."

The cause of these things becoming public, can be known only to yourself and them; but this is certain, that, of what was first published, not one syllable has been retracted by any competent authority, and that, therefore, to the full extent of the wide circulation of your paper, the original calumny remains, I trust not unrefuted, but without mitigation or abatement on the part of those from whom it proceeded. Their motto is that of Pilate, "What I have written, I have written." The existence and continuance of this controversy, with all its concomitants and results, must, therefore, be attributed to the Unitarians of Manchester, who, if they did not expect that their Orthodox neighbours would accept the challenge, must have thought them either very timid, or very indifferent. Their murmurings about newspaper controversy, are also equally unreasonable; for the fact is, that they not only uttered the shout of defiance, and made the onset, but your paper was actually chosen as the arena of the conflict. They are now evidently desirous of being considered as receiving, rather than as having given the assault; but this is because the attack which they made has been sustained and repelled: for a body of assailants, when defeated and retiring, appears to be undergoing an attack, when in truth it is experiencing a repulse. If they complain, it is only of inconveniences which are occasioned by their own acts, and by the temper they themselves have displayed.

"Quis tulerit Gracchos de seditione querentes?"

They have now, indeed, every reason to lament that rashness by which they have brought upon themselves the

powerful and pungent retaliation of the gentleman who has done me the honour to become my namesake, and who, disdaining to imitate the declamatory invective of the Unitarian Manifesto, most provokingly strikes home with arguments and facts—with arguments which I have seen nothing to confute, and facts which yet remain unshaken. In this part of the controversy, however, as I have hitherto had no share, so I now feel no disposition to interfere. It is in good hands ; and I leave to “ Another Orthodox Dissenter,” the discussion of those “ *inky blots and rotten parchment bonds*,” by which Mr. Harris declares “ Unitarianism is not, and cannot be bound,” and of those “ Orthodox Deeds,” which Mr. Harris cannot endure, because they say, “ hitherto shalt thou go, and no further.”

The principal feature which has been developed during this correspondence, is, that not only are the Orthodox totally undeserving of the obloquy which it has been attempted to fix upon them, but that such attempts are peculiarly unbecoming the English Unitarians, who owe every civil and religious blessing, under God, to the fidelity and constancy of the Orthodox of former days, and who, themselves, as a body, have never yet achieved or endured any thing for the general good. This is, indeed, their own confession, in Mr. Harris’s speech :—“ Orthodoxy,” says he, “ has been tried for ages ;” and then he exhorts his friends to unite in “ trying the other system.” Until the early part of the eighteenth century, Unitarianism as it is now understood, existed in England, only in a few individuals dispersed among the Orthodox churches, and from that period we may date their having a regular ministry, and distinct congregations. I would therefore beg their permission to advise them quietly to enjoy the good which they derive from what Mr. Harris styles “ the deeds of Orthodoxy ;” and to refrain from boasting of “ the spirit of Unitarianism,” until they can describe some general benefits procured, and some general injuries averted, or redressed, which shall bear the proportion of one to a thousand of what is recorded in, what I call the **Chronicles of Orthodoxy**.

It is not uncommon for Unitarians to pique themselves on a peculiar liberality of sentiment, and on the exercise of superior mental freedom ; and most cheerfully is it acknowledged, that distinguished Unitarians have been eminent for these noble qualifications. It is pleasing to dwell on the high and amiable character of the philosophic and benevolent Priestley—to applaud the conscientious and manly determinations of the Vicar of Catterick—of a Jebb and an Evanston ; and were this a personal question, it would be a delightful task to award the meed of female excellency to a Barbauld and a Cappe. But the question forced upon us by the Unitarians themselves, is actually this :—Do the tenets and principles of Unitarianism furnish a security and safeguard for their persevering and unflinching attachment to the rights of conscience and the cause of religious freedom? And when it is considered how much of intellectual power and acquirement, and how much of social weight and influence confessedly belong to many individuals of that body, it is evidently very desirable to ascertain that their principles are, as they pretend, so identified with those of mental independence and religious freedom, as to assure their loyalty to its sacred cause, and to render it impossible for them, even in the day of trial, to revolt to its enemies, or to desert its standard. In all these cases it is best to appeal to facts ; and the last half century of our history has produced three occasions by which we may “try the spirits” of the professors of the Unitarian belief, but, I am sorry to add, that neither of them furnishes a favourable result.

The first of these examples occurred in the year 1772, when many clergymen of the Church of England, who held Unitarian sentiments, petitioned the Legislature for relief from the necessity of subscribing the articles of that Church, because that subscription was opposed to their conscientious belief. This petition was signed by about two hundred and fifty, among whom were the celebrated Law, Bishop of Carlisle, and Archdeacon Blackburne ; but its prayer was rejected by the House of Commons, and the subscription was enforced. Notwithstanding this, the petitioners, with the

exception of Mr. Lindsay, clung to the emoluments of a Church, the doctrines of which they had publicly declared they no longer believed ; and Mr. Lindsay had to complain with indignation, that, of the multitudes who concurred in his sentiments, only one member of the Establishment was found to contribute towards the expense of erecting his chapel. What a contrast this, to the self-denying conduct of the two thousand *Orthodox* clergymen, who, on the passing of the act of Uniformity, rather than compromise their consciences, unhesitatingly exposed themselves to poverty, to bonds, to imprisonment and death !

The other two cases have occurred more recently. One of them was Lord Sidmouth's attempt virtually to repeal the Toleration Act ; and the other, Mr. Brougham's abortive effort to restrain the Dissenters in the education of their children.

With respect to Lord Sidmouth's Bill, which struck at the root of our religious liberties, and was evidently preparatory to their total extinction, it is exceedingly painful to refer to a letter which the Rev. T. Belsham, the leading Unitarian minister in this kingdom, the biographer and successor of Lindsay, publicly addressed to the author of that measure. In that letter, the preacher fawns, and crouches, and licks the feet of the Peer,—he ridicules that animated opposition by which the Dissenters strangled the monster in its birth—he pours contempt on a laborious and useful class of ministers of the Gospel, whom he styles “ illiterate fanatics ”—he actually instructs his Patron how he may frame another Bill, so artfully as to beguile the Dissenters and carry his point—and to crown the whole, with an insolence which could find a place only in a breast so devoted to servility and sycophancy as his, as if he had a right to represent the Dissenting body, he humbles himself before Lord Sidmouth on account of their opposition to his Bill, and in their name, and in the most cringing and obsequious manner, deprecates his anger and implores his forgiveness. The same writer, in a series of sermons which he entitles “ Christianity pleading for the patronage of the Civil Power, &c. &c.” renounces the essential

principles of Nonconformity—he declares that he sees no good reason why Christianity may not occasionally “lift her mitred front in Courts and Parliaments”—he endeavours at great length to refute the opinions of those who hold that Christianity neither needs nor requires the patronage of the Civil Power—to which patronage he even ascribes the continued existence of Christianity—and thus the living patriarch of English Unitarianism adopts and advocates the principle of the alliance between Church and State, to which he avers, that our Lord’s declaration, “My kingdom is not of this world” furnishes no objection.

In the affair of Mr. Brougham’s Education Bill, which (though the project of a man in other respects favourable to liberty) would have abolished all the important plans now in operation for the educating of the children of the poor, and would have inflicted a blow on the Dissenting interest, more deadly than any since the iniquitous measures of the last years of Queen Anne, the Orthodox Dissenters were alive to the evils with which it was fraught, to which they maintained a strenuous and successful opposition. At that time, however, there was found at least one Unitarian minister\* to avow himself the friend and advocate of that Bill, and to do his utmost to include all the Dissenters in his own pledge. I do not mean to infer of this or that individual Unitarian, that he would follow these examples, but it is most decidedly evident that men who are very far gone in that mode of faith, may yet become the flatterers and abettors of those who would infringe and even destroy our religious liberties.

The Protestant Cantons of Switzerland furnish an illustration applicable to this topic. There, the Orthodox doctrine which was formerly preached, has been superseded and

\* The Rev. William Shepherd, of Gateacre, near Liverpool, who in a letter to John Wilks, Esq., published in the Times Newspaper of February 5th, 1821, describes himself as the warm friend and advocate, and even the *adviser* of Mr. Brougham’s Education Bill, and sums up his opinions in the following terms; viz. “But I am persuaded that *no sacrifice*, shall we (the Dissenters) by his Bill, be called upon to make, save the sacrifice of UNREASONABLE JEALOUSY AND SUSPICION.”

displaced by the Unitarian System, which has gained the ascendancy in Church and State. The recent revival of Orthodoxy in that country has been met, however, not by that spirit of liberality and tolerance which Unitarians claim as their own, but by all the rigour of restraint and persecution. It has been opposed by the excited violence of the multitude, and by penal enactments on the part of the civil and ecclesiastical authorities. In the Canton de Vaud,\* there is now

\* ‘The following Extract is from one of the Clergymen of the Canton de Vaud:—“ I am about to quit my office of Pastor ; and, at the same time, our “ National Church. For this year past, the religious operations, which God “ has carried on in our Canton, have been redoubled. Two of our young brethren have been driven from the National Church for having held in their “ own houses prayer-meetings, for the edification of those among their parishioners, whom the grace of God had awakened, and for having spoken out “ upon the abuses, which exist in our National Church. Two others, one of “ whom is my brother, have voluntarily left the Church of the Canton. In “ many places, the people have grossly insulted, and even committed acts of “ violence against those, who manifest plainly their attachment to the Lord, “ who will no longer live according to the course of this present evil world ; “ and who meet together for mutual edification. They, who have committed “ these injuries, have been either unpunished altogether, or punished very “ slightly. Every where we are regarded as the dirt. Lately, our Government “ issued a decree, which condemns to fine and imprisonment those who assist “ at private meetings, those who preside at them, and those who lend a room “ for them ; and even those who try to make converts to what they call, a sect. “ This decree is accompanied by two letters addressed to the local magistrates, “ and to the pastors, in which they take occasion of the indiscreet zeal of some “ individuals, to blacken the whole ; they present under false colours, the “ evangelical doctrines which we preach, in order to make them to be considered as the opinions of a sect, dangerous, and subversive of morality and “ civil society ; and they exhort the pastors, to try to stop the progress of this “ pretended sect. After such a decree, I thought I could not remain an instant “ longer in the National Church. I sent in my resignation to the Government, “ and I shall shortly quit my parish.”

Such persecutions as those above described, are almost without a parallel in the history of any other Protestant Church ; and they are the more extraordinary in the Canton de Vaud ; from the fact of that church having, so lately as the year 1816, remonstrated with the Canton of Geneva for treating the Christians in that Church in a similar manner. Although most of the heresies in the Protestant Churches on the continent are attributable to Neology, it does not appear that that peculiar kind of error prevails among the established clergy of the Canton de Vaud, but rather the mixture of Arianism and Socinianism, which is the reigning creed at Geneva.

Your Committee would mention another circumstance in more immediate



in force against the Orthodox, a decree which is almost a fac simile of the Conventicle Act. That decree forbids, under penalties of fine and imprisonment, to be present at any meetings for private worship—to preside in them—or to furnish a place for them ;—and the same penalties are pronounced against those “ whose proceedings shall tend to gain proselytes to a Sect, contrary to the peace of religion and the public order.” Thus are the Orthodox dealt with by the Unitarian authorities in Switzerland. I will not retort the unjustifiable and unprovoked accusations which the Manchester Unitarians have published against us ; I will not render “ railing for railing,” and charge them with “ *a mean and slavish,—with a cruel, vindictive, and persecuting spirit ;*” but I am constrained to acknowledge, that I see nothing in all these facts to prove, that the spirit of Unitarianism, is as they boast, “ *free as the winds of heaven, and desires that every human creature may be so too.*”

It is amusing to hear gentlemen calling for an explanation of the very terms which, so far as this discussion is concerned, originated with themselves.—For my own part, I

connection with your Society ;—“ A short time ago, it was announced from the “ pulpits of the town of St. Gall, that in two discourses it would be proved from “ the word of God, that Christ had no share whatever in the Godhead, and “ should only be considered as one exhibiting the dignity and excellence of our “ nature. At the hour appointed Neff, one of the Agents of the Continental “ Society, attended, and took large notes of these discourses ; and did his best, “ in a small pamphlet, to refute what he had heard out of that word, which he “ considered the preacher had handled so deceitfully. This pamphlet was by “ himself and other friends to the truth put into large circulation, along with “ copies of the New Testament. The consequence of which appears to be, “ that the said discourses produced a very opposite effect upon the public mind, “ to that which the author of them had calculated. The clergy were much “ irritated ; a complaint from them was unanimously preferred to the authorities against Neff, who was presently brought up to appear before them for “ this piece of offensive conduct. The matter was heard, and poor Neff was “ sentenced to pay 100 Swiss fr. about £7. 10s. and to suffer six months imprisonment. That he might, however, be made sensible of the mercy of “ the Court, the latter part of the sentence was commuted to the payment “ only of the former, as he had a young and increasing family, without any “ other means of subsistence than his own labour.”—Sixth Report of the CONTINENTAL SOCIETY for the diffusion of religious knowledge over the Continent of Europe, pp. 8—10.

have continued to use the term Unitarian because it is the term of their own adoption, and I wish to avoid giving offence: but that term no more distinguishes them from the Orthodox, than it does from the Arians, Sabellians, or the New Jerusalem Church. To call them Presbyterians, while they have not the shadow of a synodical government, would be just as correct as to call them Episcopalians. Indeed I have often been surprised at their unwillingness to be called Socinians. The Socini, both uncle and nephew, were men of great eminence in their day; and as they first embodied the doctrines held by modern Unitarians, it is natural they should bear their name.

As this discussion has been continued, I regret the retirement of my friend "An Unitarian Christian;" for though his display of superior talents rendered him a more formidable opponent than any other who has appeared on that side, yet, with a temper such as his, though the controversy might have become warm, it could never have been acrimonious. I confess, too, that, in these controversies, the giving of individual names has not my unqualified approbation. In the present case, I beg to question the right of those who have put us so completely on the defensive by their own published accusations, to require this disclosure; and, in all cases, it gives to argument an air of personal hostility, which I am always anxious to avoid. Yet that my motives for retaining my old signature may not be misconstrued, allow me to inform you, that "An Orthodox Dissenter" is

Your obedient servant,

JOHN BIRT.

*Manchester, December 1, 1824.*

---

*To the Editor of the Manchester Gazette.*

Sir,—As "my learned friend," Mr. Samuel Kay, has, through the medium of your Paper, stepped forward in support of Mr. Wood, in the controversy respecting the Unitarian Chapels, Funds, and Endowments; and as he has ad-

vanced arguments, which he supports with the weight of his name, without any foundation in law, I think it due to the cause of truth to point out what I consider to be his legal inaccuracy.

Before I proceed to the consideration of this part of the controversy, I wish to draw the attention of your readers to some parts of Mr. Kay's statement. He says "I am anxious to allay the fears, and ease the doubts, of your Correspondent. 'Another Orthodox Dissenter,' who says, the endowment of Cross Street Chapel is ample. I (Mr. Kay) tell him he says the thing that is not, in the sense in which he wishes your readers to understand him, namely, that the endowment is of Orthodox Creation. Cross Street Chapel has no endowment at all coeval with its foundation, nor has it any auxiliary funds but such as owe their origin to some of the present generation of its Members. He will permit me to tell him he has assumed "a meaning never meant," for the sake of giving a contradiction to it. I have perused the three lists of Unitarian Chapels, one of which, viz. the Lancashire list, I procured from various friends for the purpose of insertion in your Paper, and it must be evident to every impartial reader, that this rule was observed, in each of them, namely when it was known that the endowments to the Chapels, &c. were originated by the *Orthodox* so to state it; when it was known to have been originated by *Socinians* also to state it; and when their origin was unknown, to state merely that there were endowments. His contradiction, therefore, amounts to nothing at all, even if he be correct in point of fact; but what, if his statement should be found incorrect? Has Mr. Kay consulted the titles to those endowments? I doubt it very much. Will Mr. Kay inform you, Sir, whether the endowment of the land on which the Commercial Buildings, near this Chapel, are erected, and on which an inn formerly stood, but which was, I am informed, sold by the trustees to Mr. Dinwiddie, at a yearly rent of 100*l.* was purchased by the present Members, or is of *Orthodox* Creation? You will perceive, Sir, that I may be incorrect, because I have not the "Venerable Parchments" before me,

but if the inaccuracy be, as I am told it is, with Mr. Kay himself, with the access to the deeds which I presume he possesses, it will be a little singular, and his reproof of the supposed inaccuracy of my friend will apply to himself, with much greater reason.

Mr. Kay must excuse me for remarking, that he shews rather too much eagerness for a law suit, when he earnestly "entreats" his opponents to indulge their zeal "in getting an information filed by His Majesty's Attorney General to redress the wrong" complained of; and boasts that his clients, the Cross Street congregation "will meet them without fear."

There are, Sir, several statements in Mr. Kay's letter in which I have the pleasure to agree with him. I will name them.

First, Mr. Kay, in opposition to Mr. Wood, says, that the dispute respecting the Unitarian Chapels is not a theological question, but a question of property.

Secondly, He says that the late Mr. Mottershead, found his congregation, about ninety years ago, rigid Calvinists; to which I add, that I presume he will not deny that Mr. Mottershead came to the Chapel as a minister of Calvinistic sentiments.\* He also says, "Mr. S. Seddon was the first to speak in our Chapel what were then called Socinian Doctrines, *but it does not appear that many, certainly not the greater part of his hearers concurred with him in opinion,*" but I beg leave to add to this statement an extract from the speech of the Chairman at the late Unitarian dinner. "From the death of the Rev. Mr. Seddon, (he says) which I believe, took place in 1769, to your (Mr. Grundy's) election, and that of my other esteemed friend on my left, Mr. Robberds, (being upwards of 40 years,) the important and peculiar doctrines of Unitarian belief were rarely, indeed, I believe, scarcely ever, urged on the attention of the congregation. In avoiding the discussion and even the declaration of the particular principles of the congregation, over

\* He was, I believe, a pupil of the Rev. Timothy Jollie, of Attercliffe, near Sheffield.

which your predecessors presided, there can be no doubt that those gentlemen had satisfied their own minds that they were executing their duties in a manner best *calculated for public usefulness* ; and though, I do not concur in the views which regulated their conduct, yet I censure them not, for they acted conscientiously ;—the tomb has closed upon them with honour ;—and I participate in the respect with which their memory is regarded. The effect, however, of their conduct was such, that when you, Sir, entered on your office as minister, Unitarian doctrines were *little understood* by many of the congregation, *by some they were not even recognized.*” What further discoveries will be made of the doctrinal sentiments of the Cross Street congregation no one can foresee, but these are the views of the Gentlemen who offer themselves as their advocates ; Calvinists, Arminians, Arians, and Socinians, they are, and have been, by their own confession, and what they will be hereafter, “influenced,” as Mr. Kay says, “by a spirit of calm enquiry and Christian candour” it is quite impossible to foresee.

Mr. Kay says that his opponents make a charge against a large and respectable body of Dissenters, “affecting, in direct terms, their moral integrity ; a charge which if proved to be true against any *private* individual would be sufficient to banish him from society for ever.” On this point he is exceedingly zealous, and says, “the rents of the pews in the Chapel form the ample endowment, which the jealousies of both his opponents would make the public believe that the present congregation are defrauding the representatives of the Orthodox founders of the Chapel who died a century ago.” This is Mr. Kay’s own statement, the accuracy of which, I leave him, and his clients, the congregation at Cross Street, to settle amongst themselves.

It is quite obvious, then, from their admissions and previous statements, that the Chapel was erected by the friends of Mr. Newcome ; that it was appropriated to the principles of Orthodoxy ; that it mainly continued so until the death of Mr. Mottershead, except so far as Mr. Seddon may be said to have introduced a different sentiment, in which, however,

I conclude (upon Mr. Kay's authority) that *not many* concurred and which, undoubtedly, occasioned the secession of part of the congregation, who settled at the Independent Chapel, in Cannon Street; and, afterwards, until the time when Messrs. Grundy and Robberds commenced their ministry at this Chapel, about the year 1810, they appear to have been partly Arminian and partly Arian; and that since that period to this time Unitarianism has been avowed; although, I must own, that the extraordinary sentiments previously entertained by the Congregation, naturally enough tended to it, according to the maxim of Dr. Priestley, who contended, that to form a true judgment concerning the particular tenets of Unitarianism, it was advantageous "to attain to a cool unbiassed temper of mind, in consequence of becoming *more indifferent to religion in general, and to all the modes and doctrines of it.*" The accuracy of this opinion is remarkably exemplified in the congregation at Cross Street Chapel, in this our town of Manchester.

I have thus endeavoured to state the several particulars which I do not mean to dispute with Mr. Kay, but I have now the office of pointing out the subjects on which we disagree.

"He says, I will refer you, Sir, to the highest authority; the Legislature itself, *from the Act of Toleration* in King William's time, to the late act for repealing the penalties on those who impugn the doctrine of the Trinity, has, to its honour, recognized the sacred rights of private judgment, and declared all those who acknowledge the sufficiency of the Scriptures, for the guidance and rule of Christians, to be entitled to the privileges of British subjects, equally with those who worship within the pale of the Established Church itself."

If Mr. Belsham be to be credited, Unitarians do not acknowledge the sufficiency, but the inconclusiveness, of the Scriptures; and are not, therefore, even upon that ground entitled to the benefit of these legislative enactments; but this I will not discuss. Mr. Kay has, however, referred to the acts in King William's reign, without the least attention to

those acts. The Toleration Act which he here relies upon with extraordinary confidence was passed in the first year of William and Mary, and by the 17th Section of it, it is declared, that “neither that act, nor any clause, article, or thing therein contained, “should extend, or be construed to extend, to give any ease, benefit, or advantage to any person that *should deny, in his preaching or writing, the doctrine of the blessed Trinity*, as it is declared in the articles” therein referred to, which are so many of the 39 articles of the Church of England as relate to doctrine ; and by the 9th and 10th of the same reign of King William, it is enacted, that all persons who “shall by writing, printing, teaching, or advised speaking, *deny any one of the persons in the Holy Trinity to be God*” shall incur certain disabilities therein mentioned, and on a second conviction be imprisoned three years, &c.

Now, Sir, it is evident that Mr. Kay wrote his letter in total forgetfulness of these acts of Parliament ; and, as far as Cross Street Chapel is concerned, which was built and settled in trust about five years after the passing of the Toleration Act (the one first referred to), it is quite obvious, that the settlement deed must be for the support of Orthodox principles, and could not be for the purposes to which it is now applied, which are alike opposed to the intention of the individuals who purchased and set apart that property for the propagation of Orthodox doctrines, and to the law of the land, as it stood at the time the settlement was made.

Mr. Wood is, therefore, wholly unsupported in his hypothesis, that Mr. Newcome and his friends might have appropriated this property to the purposes of Unitarianism ; and is it not very extraordinary that Mr. Wood has stated the terms of the trust-deeds hypothetically, when we may reasonably suppose that he has the means of stating them positively from the deeds themselves.

I trust, Mr. Editor, you will not forget, that I am treating this question as a matter which, according to Mr. Kay’s own admission, relates to property alone, and with which

the principles of religious liberty have nothing whatever to do.

Before I proceed further with my argument, I will just remark, that the founders of this Chapel had, as every person who contributes to the establishment of a religious institution still has, an undoubted right to devote their property to such purposes, and upon such principles (if those principles were not contrary to law) as they thought fit, and that they might settle that Chapel on such trusts as were consistent with their views and sentiments; but no man will surely contend that the founders of a Chapel contemplate the accommodation of themselves and their families alone, but also the instruction of the public, and although Mr. Kay's ancestor may have been one of the founders of this Chapel (and surely such an ancestor would have regretted to find a descendant advocating the application of his property to the subversion of his principles) yet that circumstance alone gives to Mr. Kay no title beyond what is possessed by every attendant at the place.

The pew holders, as such, are persons who merely avail themselves of the privileges secured to them by the trust deeds; but they have no right to alter or to depart from the terms of such deeds, although they have full liberty to surrender those privileges, and quit the Chapel altogether. This is a principle acknowledged by all Dissenters, unless the Unitarians form an exception to this general rule, but I have yet to learn what Mr. Wood means by "the lofty spirit, and true principles of English Protestant Dissent," if he supposes that spirit, and those principles, to have any operation or effect whatever upon a trust deed.

Now, Sir, I ask whether Mr. Newcome would consistently with his own sentiments, recorded in the writings handed down to us, and some of which at least are accessible to any one, (having been recently published) set apart this property to the denial of those great and cardinal doctrines which this eminent and highly gifted man so steadfastly maintained. He was one of those who were



attached to the Royalist cause, and even assisted Sir George Booth in effecting the Restoration of King Charles II., for which he was rewarded by that ungrateful Monarch with an ejectionment from the living he held in this parish. Rather than submit, therefore, to an undue and improper exercise of the authority of his Royal Master, to whose restoration he had rendered important assistance, he became one of the 2000 ministers who chose to sacrifice their all on the altar of conscience.

If, then, such a man preferred the making of such sacrifices rather than submit to an usurped authority, in a matter of discipline only, how much more steadily was he prepared to “resist even to blood,” rather than submit to any usurped jurisdiction in any matter which related to Christian doctrine? If he deemed it his duty to resist the king, who was indebted to him for adventuring his life and fortune in the royal cause, when that Monarch chose to usurp an authority in requiring submission to “rites and ceremonies” only, and to surrender his living, what sacrifice would not such a man have made, if called upon to bear testimony to the great doctrines of the Gospel as entertained by Orthodox Christians? Let any man, who doubts the force of this irresistible truth, read his works. With what feelings then, must every person who considers this subject aright, turn to the flippant enquiry of Mr. Wood. “What if Henry Newcome should have made no provision whatever for Unitarianism, or any other *ism*, if he should have wisely avoided attempting to impose fetters on the human mind, or stay the progress of religious truth—but, duly appreciating the liberty with which Christ had made him free, should have been contented to leave those who were to follow him, free to obey the convictions of their own minds—to form their creed not by the authority of Church or State, but by the light of their own religious inquiries, and the honest dictates of conscience?” Instead of making these inquiries, why did not the worthy gentleman tell us plainly, whether the wording of the original trust deeds does or does not autho-

rize the preaching in Mr. Newcome's Chapel of Unitarian doctrines? He talks indignantly against the fraudulent concealment of deeds, about which he appears to know nothing at all, and with which he is no way concerned; but did not the Unitarians at Wolverhampton refuse to shew the deeds to Mr. Mander the only legal trustee, and to the minister of the place, at a time when such a reasonable act would probably have brought all disputes to an end. Does he mean to say that these chapel deeds may be seen? I think he does not, but I charge no impropriety of conduct, whatever, on that account. It is, however, impossible to suppose that Mr. Newcome, who had sacrificed every thing in the maintenance of the rights of conscience, in a matter merely relating to ecclesiastical jurisdiction, should nevertheless be so unconcerned about the infinitely more important and momentous doctrines of the Trinity, atonement, and other Orthodox sentiments, as to found a Chapel, which any body of men, who might be pleased to consider themselves possessed of superior light, were to be at liberty at any future time, to appropriate to the denial of those very doctrines? Is it conceivable that he was so indifferent to these essential truths, as to be regardless whether his property was applied to their maintenance or subversion? Yet this is the rule applied by the Unitarians to their usurpations of the property of Orthodox Dissenters, which is strikingly exemplified in the misapplication of the estates of the late truly excellent Lady Hewley, which were left for Orthodox purposes, but are principally applied, at this time, to the education, support, and maintenance of a body of men, the Unitarian Ministry, in these northern counties, who devote their lives and talents to the subversion of those very principles which her Ladyship entertained, and for the maintenance and propagation of which she devised her property. I cannot better convey my sentiments on this subject than by quoting the indignant language of an eloquent friend, "the misappropriation of Lady Hewley's fund" says he, "not designed to pension the strong, so much as to

aid the weak, is a grievance which would justify our loudest complaints—an act of injustice which deserves the most unqualified reprobation.”

One of the young gentlemen of the York Academy, Mr. Worthington, who has been educated at the expence of Lady Hewley’s estate, is, it seems, invited to the pulpit of Mr. Newcome, at Cross-street Chapel, that he may devote his life and exercise his Christian ministry to the subversion of the principles of both! To preach doctrines at which both those excellent persons would have shuddered!

The Trustees may be honourable men, one of them, an old neighbour of my own, I know to be exceedingly so, and the injustice complained of may be, and probably is, founded in misapprehension and mistake, but the worthy gentleman I have referred to, is very little aware of the opinion entertained on this subject by vast bodies of able, and enlightened men of almost all denominations. This is, however, a subject to which my able and honoured friend, Mr. Turner, has promised to give his attention, and I do not wish to anticipate him in a matter to which he is so capable of doing complete justice.

Mr. Kay says further “ if a Presbyterian did not cease to be so when preferring the opinions of Arius and Arminius to those of Calvin, I DO NOT SEE how by adopting the opinions of Socinus, he could forfeit his right to be designated Presbyterian in which class of Dissenters he had been born and educated.” My learned friend says, “ *he does not see*” and it is plain that he does not; but I think, before he urged his “entreaties” in the name of his clients, the Cross Street Congregation, upon his opponents to institute a law suit for the recovery of the Chapel, he ought “to have seen” that the title “ Presbyterian” refers to a form of church discipline opposed to that of Episcopalian and Independent, and that his clients, the Cross-street Congregation, having long ago deserted the Presbyterian form of church government, which their trust deeds, according to his own admission, recognize, cannot maintain their legal right to the place. As to their right to retain the name after having

abandoned the form of government which it describes, the letter of your correspondent a "Scotch Presbyterian" is conclusive, and by Mr. Wood it would seem to be considered unanswerable. That this chapel is applied to purposes different from its original intention, both in respect of doctrine and discipline, and in violation of that intention, Mr. Kay himself has clearly and ably shewn, without however considering for one moment the legal effects of such admission. On the authority however of the highest law-officer in this realm, "*I do see*," that, for the purpose of *Unitarian or Arian worship* neither the present nor any other congregation has any legal right or title to this chapel. Every body will have marked the sneer of "the English Presbyterian" (Mr. Wood) at "the Lord Chancellor Eldon," and I admit it was very natural. In the celebrated case of the Attorney General against Pearson, 3 Merivale 353, the following principles were laid down, which I will quote from the marginal notes, that I may not occupy too much of your valuable columns. "The court (of Chancery) is bound to administer trusts for the benefit of Protestant Dissenting Congregations." "Where a trust is created for religious worship, and it cannot be discovered from the deed creating the trust what was the nature of the religious worship intended by it, it must be implied from the usage of the congregation. But if it appears to have been the Founder's intention, *although not expressed*, that a particular doctrine should be preached, it is not *in the power of the Trustees or of the Congregation to alter the designed objects of the Institution.*"

"If land or money be properly given for maintaining 'the worship of God,' *without more*, the Court will execute the trust in favour of the established religion. But, if it be *clearly expressed* that the purpose is that of maintaining dissenting doctrines, so long as they are not contrary to law, the Court will execute the trust according to the express intention. And as in that case, the intention *clearly appears aliunde*, though *not expressed in the instrument creating the trust*, the Court will also carry the manifest

design of the Founder into execution, so far as it is consistent with the law." The same opinion as to the maintenance of the original doctrines is given in the case of *Foley v. Wontner*, 2 Jacob and Walker, 247; and his Lordship in this case added, "I take it to be now settled by a case in the House of Lords, on appeal from Scotland, that the chapel must remain devoted to the doctrines originally agreed on." The case referred to was *Craigdallie* against *Aikman*, 1 Dow. P. C. 1; and it is not a little remarkable that if Mr. Kay's zeal had been restrained until the publication of that very number of your paper, of which his letter forms so prominent a part, he would have learned from your columns the truth of this doctrine from the same high authority, in the case of the Albion Chapel, which was decided in London almost on the very day of the date of my learned friend's letter. I will, with your permission, quote from your pages. His Lordship said, "Where persons brought questions of property before Courts by suspension, or any other manner in which it might be subjected to their consideration, and it could be shewn that the property was in the first instance made applicable to a particular mode of religious worship, and complaint was also made that it was applied to a mode of worship totally opposed to the purposes to *which it was first assigned*, the Court *would not permit even a majority of the individuals to depart* from the purposes to which the property was in the first place applicable."

The law then is sufficiently clear on this subject, as recognized by the Chancellor, and also in the highest court in England, the House of Lords; and that the law is consistent with equity and justice, is obvious on the very same principles which protect the rights of private property.

It follows from this statement, and from the assumption that the lists of Chapels for the four counties of Lancaster, Chester, Derby, and Nottingham, are correct, the Unitarians possess but six chapels by legal and equitable means; and that to the remaining fifty-six chapels, with all their endowments, they have no legal nor equitable right or title whatever for the maintenance of Unitarian worship.

On this subject, I offer no further remarks at present.

The facts are before the public, and with the public I leave these facts, only referring them to the printed lists, by which it is alledged that in four large and populous counties, containing upwards of a million and a half of inhabitants, out of sixty-four chapels which the people of this bragging, boasting, noisy system possess, they have originated only Six!!!

I am, Sir, your very obedient servant,

GEORGE HADFIELD.\*

*To the Editor of the Manchester Gazette.*

SIR;—Your Correspondent, the “English Presbyterian,” to whom I must now give the name of Mr. G. W. Wood, still declaims against introducing into the newspapers, a discussion respecting the funds and endowments, formerly left by the Orthodox Dissenters, but now enjoyed by the Unitarians. But why does he object to this? After all the fine things which we have heard from the Unitarians about free and unlimited discussion, there is surely no subject but what ought to be investigated. No: but he still contends that it is “a controversy on religious matters.” His coadjutor, Mr. Kay, however, is more candid, and fully agrees with me, (as I presume all other persons do,) that “the question is not theological, but one of *property*,” which may be as fitly discussed in the newspapers, as the public accounts of the town of Manchester. Authorities, from his own party, though produced by the round dozen at once, have indeed no influence whatever upon Mr. W., but, I apprehend, they, nevertheless, will have their effect with the public.

Such discussions, he further observes, “frequently serve to inflame some of the worst feelings of the human heart.” But surely this consequence is not absolutely necessary.

\* The following paragraph is copied from the preface to Mr. Grundy’s lectures, which, be it observed, were preached in Mr. Newcome’s pulpit, viz.—

“Of what importance are the points at issue, even between Protestants of the Establishment and Roman Catholics, compared with those between Unitarians and Trinitarians? What are all the minor shades of difference between all other denominations of Dissenters and the Established Church, compared with that grand point on which we differ from them all, the object of religious adoration.” Preface xviii.

If Mr. W. is so fully alive to the danger of such "feelings," let him guard against them, and I will endeavour to do the same. He complains, too, of the very objectionable language which has been used in this controversy; but this is another instance of his peculiar felicity in committing an argumentative *felo de se*. The most offensive words and allusions which have been used, those which relate to coveting and stealing, were certainly *first* brought into this discussion by himself. If he disapproves of such ideas and expressions, let him, by all means, avoid them, for, I assure him, they give as little pleasure to me, as they can possibly do to him.

I have some cause to complain that his representation of the manner in which this discussion commenced, is not quite calculated to give a correct and fair notion of it. A person who should read his last letter alone, would suppose that the controversy originated in two very moderate letters, by "An Orthodox Dissenter" and "An Unitarian Christian." But was there nothing at all, before these letters, relating to the matter? Was not there a meeting of the leading Unitarians in Manchester, where a speech was loudly applauded, in which, amidst much matter of the same description, "the spirit of Orthodoxy" was pronounced, "slavish, mean, partial and capricious, cruel and vindictive? Was not your correspondent, Mr. W., present at this meeting? I shall not say that he was "consenting to" this oration; but unless he can show that he absented himself during its delivery, or otherwise manifested his disapprobation, the public will very naturally come to this conclusion. This speech was defended in the newspapers, with new aggravations, by its author; and when I took up the subject, no Unitarian, either with or without a name, had taken a single public measure to disavow the defence. This, I conceive, is the true representation of the earlier part of the discussion: and yet Mr. W. assumes the tone of one belonging to a highly injured party: just as if they were to go to what lengths they please in the newspapers, and others were to have no will or pleasure in the matter.

It seems to be the determination of your correspondent to

have no concern whatever with the subject in its general hearings; and therefore, he has passed over the greater, and more important, part of my letter, without a single word of notice. Let me, however, extricate the real question, at issue once more, from the cloud of words and things, foreign to the purpose, in which he has enveloped it, and place it fairly in public view. A considerable number of Unitarian Ministers (whose conduct the late meeting was avowedly designed to honour,) are in the habit of publicly reprobating in the strongest terms, the leading articles of the Calvinistic and Trinitarian faith. Frequently these very Ministers receive an important part of their support from funds and endowments which were unquestionably designed by the founders, for the support and endowment of that faith. In particular, a great majority of Unitarian places in the north, receive support from the charity of Lady Hewley, who was a Calvinist and a Trinitarian. I learn, too, from the report of the York Academy for 1822, that *six* students who were educated for the Ministry among the Unitarians, received, for that year, grants of £20 each from Lady Hewley's charity. This, I conceive, was not exactly what her Ladyship intended, when she expressly appointed, in her deed of settlement, that the number of "young men" (even if they had not been of sentiments contrary to her own,) "designed for the ministry of Christ's Holy Gospel, who might receive "exhibitions" from her fund, should *never* exceed five such young men at one and the same time." This is certainly to employ the property of Lady H. and others, to overturn the principles which it was intended to support. Now, I ask, is such an appropriation of such property to be accounted just? or is it not rather to be considered as perverted from its original intention?

And what if it should be a fact, that all assistance from the charity of Lady H. is denied to those "Schools of the Prophets" whose theology accords with her own, while afforded thus abundantly to one of an opposite character? Or if there should be instances of the aid of Lady H.'s charity being afforded to chapels while Socianism has been preached



in them, but refused to the same places, when it has been supplanted by Orthodox doctrine?—"Ought these things so to be?"

A copy of Lady Hewley's will, in the preamble to which she feelingly recognizes her dependence, for the pardon of sin, on the atonement of our Lord Jesus Christ, lies before me, as well as faithful copies, or abstracts of her two deeds of settlement, in which she devotes her extensive and valuable estates to religious and other charitable uses. My interesting collection of papers contains, also, the opinions of Lord Camden in his time, repeatedly taken by a trustee to the charity on various things connected with the deeds by which it was founded: and also the opinions of several others of the most eminent men of their day. It includes, too, many curious and interesting particulars relating to the secret history of Lady H.'s posthumous affairs. I have attentively and repeatedly perused the whole mass, and, in the abundance of my *blameable ignorance*, I take upon me to say, that the reasoning of Lord Eldon, in the case of the Attorney-General v. Pearson, and in another case, discussed in Chancery a few days ago, is as fully applicable to Lady H.'s charity, as to the cases to which it is more immediately applied. The subject was presented to Lord Camden under a different aspect from that in which Lord E. has viewed it; but his reasoning, when considered analogically, is to the same effect.

I allow that it is incumbent upon Dissenters in particular to lay no more stress upon the opinions and authority of these eminent persons than is perfectly consonant with Christian liberty, and with moral justice and equity. But, in determining what is just and equitable, are the views of such persons to be treated as totally unworthy of consideration? It may be said for them, that they are not liable to be biassed by the partialities to which persons in the situation of your Correspondent, are exposed. They do not want capacity to understand the subject. To acquaint themselves with all that jurists and moralists have taught on such points, is the object of the science to which they have particularly devoted themselves. They of the present day,

and those who have lived sixty years ago, reason in the same manner. Besides, they have even the example of Mr. Belsham, and other Unitarians, on their side, as I shewed in a part of my last letter, of which your Correspondent has not taken the least notice.

And, let it be considered in what confusion the world would be involved, if the practice of Unitarians, in this matter, were introduced into all the other concerns of society. Suppose trustees were to proceed upon the same plan in other charities besides those immediately connected with religion, and in the private concerns of life, what would be the consequence? The confidence among men must cease, and universal confusion ensue. Or is it in religious concerns alone that no regard is to be paid to the views and wishes of the pious dead?

Now, Sir, what is the inference from all this? It is, that, in the opinion of the persons now mentioned, and of multitudes besides, the appropriation of Lady H.'s property to persons who impugn all her leading views of religion, is a "perversion" of that property; and, if so, the amount of it, principally devoted to the support of Unitarianism, is such, that I need not turn to any other cases, (of which there are abundance) to prove my former assertion, that "thousands annually are thus perverted in the northern counties of England alone."

Whether all this be right or wrong, a fair and just proceeding, or a "perversion," is the question which I have wished to see discussed. And what is the manner in which Mr. W. has met it? Why he, a professed friend to *free discussion*, has, repeatedly, in his printed letters, endeavoured to induce you, Sir, to exclude the subject from the pages of your useful paper. He has most assiduously avoided to meet the question in its general aspect, though challenged to it in every way. He has watched every expression of mine with the spirit of an inquisitor, to see what could be elicited which might tend to my hurt; and, if he be not careful, his own vigilance will punish him. He has chosen the plan of making the subject invidious, by applying it to a particular case, and by clothing it in words and ideas of the most of-

fensive kind, which I had never used, and then charging them upon me. I shall not adopt his vocabulary any more than his "Book of Fallacies," or it would supply some very hard terms to describe such conduct as this. In short, he has not met the question fairly, and he *dares* not thus meet it.

As my opponent is determined not to meet the general question, but to confine what he performs, in the way of argument, to an individual case, I might well be excused if I passed over his forlorn topic, without the least further notice. However I will still indulge him in his partialities, though it shall be in a more cursory manner than before. He still insists, and I must still deny, that the argument respecting Cross-street Chapel originated with me. What had I said respecting that place in particular before Mr. W. took up his pen? Had I openly charged the Unitarians with having "stolen" their chapels?—or the congregation at Cross Street with having committed any "felonious act?" No such thing. These were the flowers of rhetoric with which Mr. W. himself adorned your pages, and upon which he built his argument, as if they had proceeded from me. Let any candid man turn to what I had said respecting Cross Street Chapel in particular, and I will undertake to predict, that he will find nothing more in it than a rebuke to the leading persons connected with that place, for having loudly and publicly applauded a gross outrage upon those religious principles, the fruits and benefits of which they were not unwilling to enjoy. Such a rebuke as this I intended, and they deserved it.

My opinion was, and still is, that the topic respecting Cross-street Chapel was chosen by Mr. W. as what he calls a *ruse de guerre*, calculated to interest the popular feeling, and to draw off the attention from the general subject: and, therefore, I was the less concerned to meet his three questions in a precise and direct manner. As he complains, however, that they have not been answered to his mind, I will give him a short and sufficient reply to them all. They are all entirely frivolous, being founded upon an assumption which is manifestly false and groundless. He assumes that some persons or other, its present congregation, or some other

people, must have an *absolute property* in a chapel of this description, whereas it neither is, nor can be, the peculiar property of any particular persons whomsoever. Such property is described, in law, as held in *mortmain*, or by a *dead-hand*, which implies that no persons living have an absolute control over it. Every person alike is entitled to make use of it, for the purposes for which it is set apart; even the property of the trustees in it, is of a very modified character, as the name of their office plainly implies. Law, reason, justice, and the custom in every other case, call upon them to preserve it sacred to the purposes which its founders intended. The question, therefore, is one in which trustees, principally, if not entirely, are the persons concerned, and it is, indeed, worthy of their most serious consideration.

Let Mr. W., therefore, instead of farther amusing himself with these unmeaning questions, turn his attention to an axiom which I gave him, as containing the sum of the whole matter, but which he has found it convenient to overlook. "*Trust property is not left to persons to do what they please with it, but for purposes which are to be promoted by it: and when persons cannot, or will not, devote it to those purposes, they ought, in common honesty, to relinquish all connexion with it.*" If he can controvert this, or show that the practice of Unitarians is consistent with it, he will do more to the purpose than he has yet done.

I proposed to part with the term *Orthodoxy* on very reasonable terms, but I forgot at what a loss Unitarians would be without it, and a few such words. Without them, upon what must their taunts and ridicule be expended? It was useless to tell your Correspondent how little stress I and my connexions laid upon this word; still he is witty at the hazard of being frivolous, like the Baronet who had the same dish served up every day, because he had just one joke to which that dish was the necessary precursor. However, let me indulge him in his laugh, while I give him a definition of *Orthodoxy*. The orthodoxy of each chapel fund and endowment, is that of its founder, and by this its trustees are to be directed in the purposes to which they devote it, unless its founder has otherwise provided in his deed.

He intimates that the founders of Cross-street Chapel left their successors "free to obey the convictions of their own mind," &c. So does every trust deed in Britain leave every human being "free to obey the convictions of his own mind, and to form his own creed." But, in using his freedom, he is not to carry about with him, at pleasure, property which has been devoted to specific purposes: this has been made stationary and is not to be driven about by the winds. But what if the case had been otherwise? Do not the Unitarians find themselves equally "free" to devote chapels, and other property, to what purposes they please, even though there were most express provisions in the trust deeds to the contrary? I know, and can prove, that the deeds of some of their chapels do require, that the doctrine of the ministers who occupy them, shall be agreeable to the doctrinal Articles of the Church of England. Cockey Moor Chapel is one of them: and Platt Chapel, as was stated in the Lancashire list, is, if living memory can be depended upon, another, and your correspondent can doubtless explain to the public how the trust of Platt Chapel is executed.

But I see, still, that nothing can be done without the production of the deeds themselves. Your correspondent, Mr. Kay tells us, (quite in opposition to Mr. W.) that Cross Street Chapel is a trust for the purposes of Presbyterianism. Well, so be it. Is, then, the deed of trust thus far observed? No such thing. Your sensible and close-thinking correspondent the "Scotch Presbyterian," (who is utterly unknown to me) has demonstrated that the Unitarians have nothing of Presbyterianism about them. What does Mr. W. say to this? He gives the worthy North Briton compliments in return for his arguments, and nothing more. Such as he has he gives unto him.

Does, then, the execution of this trust consist in merely preserving the word *Presbyterian*? If your Unitarian correspondents mean any thing, this is the extravagance which they must intend. But have they been faithful even to this? By no means. Before this discussion commenced, the

words *Presbyterian* and *Presbyterianism* were pretty well consigned to the shades. Is this the appellation that they usually give to their people, or their chapels? I have not happened to see it, for many years, before the present revival. At the ever-memorable dinner, for instance, every thing was *Unitarian*—nothing *Presbyterian*. The persons assembled were “a very numerous and most respectable body of gentlemen professing *Unitarian* Christianity.” The occasion of the meeting, was “the cause of *Unitarian* Christianity.” The inscription on the plate presented, speaks indeed of a “Chapel, in Cross-street, Manchester,” but it is not stated to be *Presbyterian*; it is “the cause of *Unitarian* Christianity” that has been “advocated” in it, and for which the late minister is rewarded. When the present minister at Cross-street Chapel mentions himself and his brethren, in his speech, they are all “*Unitarian* ministers.” And, lastly, with the Rev. George Harris, the great theme of his eloquence is “*Unitarian* Christianity.” An English Presbyterian in that happy company, I trow would have been an outlandish character indeed.—But now the word *Presbyterian* is, at once, the object of your correspondent’s fondest care, and the rock of his defence.

I can only wish this gentleman had taken a different course, and instead of grasping at a word, had tried to defend the thing really in dispute. If he would have done this, he may rely upon it, he would have performed a very essential service to the denomination to which he belongs. In parting with him for the present, I wish to give him no personal offence, but I must tell him, that he will find airs of importance, to possess but a very moderate share of efficiency in the present contest. And let him not confine himself, in future, to the tactics of a Fabius, for it will be perceived that they proceed from a conscious want of strength; but let him really grapple with the question at issue.

I now proceed to the mighty task of subscribing my real but humble name to the opinions and reasonings of Lord Eldon, Lord Camden, Mr. Justice Holroyd, Sir Samuel

Romilly, Mr. Belsham, and sundry other Unitarians, *cum multis aliis*, and remain, Sir,

Your Obedient Servant,

JAMES TURNER.

*Knutsford, Dec. 11, 1824.*

*To George William Wood, Esq.*

Sir,—Religious controversy is by no means suitable, either to my genius or inclination ; but having read your two letters in the Manchester Gazette, the first signed “An English Presbyterian,” and the latter by your proper name, it appeared to me that you had not taken a just view of the subject under discussion, and that, perhaps, a candid and respectful representation of my opinion, with my reasons for forming it, might have some little influence in correcting your’s. I am encouraged to entertain this hope, because, though I have not the honour of being personally acquainted with you, your public character is such as gives you no mean place in my esteem. I have admired your attachment to the cause of civil liberty,—your veneration of some of the principles of dissent,—your desire for the increase of knowledge,—your compassion towards the objects of human misery,—and your “integrity of conduct and general blamelessness of behaviour, in all that concerns your dealings with the world.” Could you divest yourself of that degree of prejudice, which an attachment to Unitarianism appears to have on your judgment, and consider the point at issue, between you and the “Orthodox Dissenters,” as if it were a subject relating only to the common affairs of life, I am persuaded your and their views of the case would not materially differ. Were you appointed an executor of a friend’s will, and did you know the mind of the testator, as clearly as may be ascertained, the intention of those who erected and endowed the ancient dissenting places of worship, in this and the neighbouring counties, I have that opinion of your “integrity of conduct,” that you would soon decide,

that they are *unjustly and illegally* held by those who now occupy them.

I am, Sir, one of the many who think, that the possession of these places by those who call themselves “Unitarians,” or “English Presbyterians,” is a “perversion of property, which, if proved to be true against any *private* individual, would be sufficient to banish him from the society” of truly respectable persons. I have not come to such a conclusion precipitately, nor without sufficient data. Having been, for some time past, engaged in collecting materials for the *Life* of Oliver Heywood, about to be published with the whole of his *Works*, now in the press, my attention has necessarily been directed to the history of the early Non-conformists, particularly in this county, and the West Riding of Yorkshire. And, I imagine, that a plain statement of a few facts will convince any impartial person, that most of these chapels were built by “Orthodox Dissenters,” for the preaching of *Orthodox* doctrines, and the use of *Presbyterian* congregations; but the persons now occupying them are neither Orthodox in sentiment, nor Presbyterian in discipline.

The Unitarians maintain doctrines, some of which are the very reverse of those religious truths believed and beloved by their forefathers. I need not, Sir, inform you what were the *doctrinal* sentiments of the early Non-conformists in general, and the founders of Cross-street Chapel in particular. You are, no doubt, acquainted with the writings of these venerable men; otherwise I might refer you to the works of Howe, and Baxter, and Bates, and Charnock, and Heywood, and the Treatises and published Sermons of *Newcome*. These holy men received and preached those doctrines generally called orthodox. Mr. S. Kay, in his letter of the 24th ultimo, furnishes the public with still later information respecting the orthodoxy of the congregation at Cross-street Chapel. He states, that—“The pious Mr. Mottershead found his congregation, about ninety years ago, rigid Calvinists.” Here then, Sir, we have evidence, such as you will not dispute, that thirty-nine years after the death



of Henry Newcome, in 1695, the congregation remained "rigid Calvinists." But the congregation of Cross-street Chapel now, and the congregations of most of the old Non-conformist places in Lancashire, and the neighbouring counties, profess the "doctrines of Unitarian belief," and they are sufficiently known to you to be directly opposed, in many particulars, to those of "rigid Calvinists."

But, Sir, the chief argument in your last letter, to prove "that the Unitarians have" not "stolen their Chapels from the Orthodox" is, that they are "English *Presbyterian* Chapels, and were built by the English Presbyterians soon after the passing of the Act of Toleration, and have continued in the uninterrupted possession of that denomination of Protestant Dissenters from that time to the present day." That some of these chapels were built by "English Presbyterians" I admit; a few before, and others "after the passing of the Act of Toleration;" but, Sir, I cannot so readily acknowledge, that those who now call themselves "English Presbyterians," are really the same "denomination of Protestant Dissenters" as those who built these Chapels. I find, that the early English Presbyterians observed the *forms*, as well as the name of Presbyterianism. O. Heywood, (a Presbyterian Minister, and an intimate friend and companion in tribulation of Henry Newcome, and who was urgently requested to become his successor at Cross-street Chapel, but declined chiefly on account of his age,) when describing the government of Presbyterian Churches in Lancashire in his days, says, in a manuscript of his father's life:—"They had their eldership in every congregation,—several congregations had their classis; and these maintained intercourse by a provincial assembly, which, for the county of Lancaster, was usually held at Preston. The elders, who sat with the ministers, carried the votes, enquired into the conversation of their neighbours, and usually sat with the ministers when they examined the communicants, and (though the ministers only examined,) yet the elders approved or disapproved." When a person desired admission to these Presbyterian Churches, he signified his intention to the minister, or one

of the elders ; and if, on examination, his religious knowledge and practice were approved he was admitted. If any member of these churches was guilty of immoral conduct, or acted contrary to their prescribed rules, he was suspended from communion for a time, or excluded, as the case required. On these principles the early "English Presbyterian" churches were formed, and according to them they were governed. I have been informed, from a very respectable source, that one of the last public acts of the Assembly, of which the pious Matthew Henry was a member, was the suspension of a minister from the exercise of his ministry, in a Chapel in this county, for *Arianism*. Now, Sir, what is there amongst the self-styled "English Presbyterians" of the present day, that bears any resemblance to this form of church government, so as to entitle them to be considered as of the same denomination ? The "Scotch Presbyterian," in his letter, very justly remarks, and you have scarcely noticed his pertinent and candid observations:—"Presbyterianism is simply a system of ecclesiastical government. Unitarians may, as well as any others, adopt that system, and then they have a right to the name. But I cannot learn that this is the case. As far as my information extends, they have no presbyteries ;—their congregations are not under courts of review of my name ;—nor is one single distinguishing principle of Presbyterianism carried into operation by them."

You appear, Sir, to imagine, that because you and others, who now worship in these chapels, built by the old "English Presbyterians," are their "lineal descendants," therefore, you are their genuine representatives." Such an argument may hold good to prove your title to an entailed estate, but not your claim to a religious character. Admit the truth of your principle, and you might at the same time be proved to be a Presbyterian, an Episcopalian, a Papist, and, perhaps, a Heathen. Some of your ancestors were probably Presbyterians : but before that mode of discipline was known in England, Episcopacy prevailed. Anterior to the Reformation, the inhabitants of our country, and your an-

cestors, then living, knew nothing of Christianity only as connected with the Church of Rome. And before the introduction of the Gospel into Britain, your ancestors probably were the worshippers of Woden. But how justly would you ridicule the idea of being denominated an Episcopalian, or a Papist, or a Heathen, because you may have lineally descended from those who were properly entitled to these appellations! Your answer to such an attempt would be, that you are neither an Episcopalian, nor a Papist, nor an Idolater, because you do not believe the doctrines, or observe the forms peculiar to such modes of worship.

The "English Presbyterians" of the present day may boast that they have "descended from ancestors who have borne that honorable appellation from the earliest infancy of Protestant Nonconformity," but that they "are the genuine representatives of the English Presbyterians," is not admitted by many, even by the Editors of a critical Journal, whose predilections you must acknowledge are not in favor of Orthodoxy. "It is curious indeed," say they, "to observe, how the subsequent history and fortune of each of these bodies (the Presbyterians and Independents,) have been determined by the characteristic difference of their original constitution. The moderate aristocracy of Presbyterianism, *as long as Presbyterianism could be said to have any form of government*, enabled its ministers to follow their own inclination with regard to the manner of conducting public worship and the strain of preaching, while the jealous democracy of Independency kept the minister under the eye and control of his people, and punished the first appearance of deviation, though merely negative, from the standard of Orthodoxy. The Presbyterian ministers became men of polished manners—partook largely of the biblical knowledge, and the elegant and scientific literature of the age, *dropped in every generation something of the Orthodoxy of their forefathers, and while their flocks gradually diminished, contented themselves with being the rational instructors of the few rather than the idols of the multitude.* Of late, they seem to have discovered, that, as a religious community,

they must speedily become extinct by adhering to this plan; new controversies have sprung up among them, and though, with a new principle of cohesion and repulsion, they may still maintain themselves as a distinct body, *the history of Presbyterianism as a sect deducing itself from the time of the great separation from the Establishment, in 1662, must be considered as very nearly closed.*" Monthly Review, New Series, Vol. LXXXI. p. 411. Thus, Sir, from the testimony both of opponents and friends, it appears, that those who now call themselves "English Presbyterians," have departed very far, both in faith and church discipline, from the founders of their chapels.

Perhaps it may be said, "what if those by whom these chapels were built, should have made no provision whatsoever for Presbyterianism, or any other *ism*—if they should have wisely avoided attempting to impose fetters on the human mind, or to stay the progress of religious truth, but, duly appreciating the liberty wherewith Christ hath made them free, should have been contented to leave those who were to follow them free, to obey the convictions of their own minds—to form their creeds, not by the authority of Church or State, but by the light of their own religious enquiries, and the honest dictates of conscience!" In reply to this I would observe, that I happen to be acquainted with the contents of the original deeds of some of the "English Presbyterian Chapels," now occupied by Unitarians, and they *do* make provision both for Presbyterianism and what some would call "rigid Calvinism." They state that these chapels are set apart for the use of "Protestant Dissenters of the Presbyterian persuasion," and require that the ministers should preach according to "the Doctrinal Articles of the Church of England," or "the Assembly's Catechism." The following is an extract from one of these deeds now before me:—

"The said edifice, or building, so erected as aforesaid, to be used and employed for and as a meeting p'ace and conveniency of an assembly of a particular Church or congregation of Protestants dissenting from the Church of

England for the free exercise of their divine and religious worship therein weekly, on the Christian Sabbaths, or Lord's days, and other days statedly and occasionally. The minister or ministers of the said congregation, to be a Protestant able minister or ministers of the gospel of the *Presbyterian persuasion*, and to pray and preach God's word, administer the sacraments of the New Testament, and perform all offices and duties belonging to that sacred function there, so as such minister or ministers of the said congregation, who, for the time being, shall officiate there, be *sound in the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, and such as hold and profess the Doctrinal Articles of the Church of England, required to be subscribed* by the Pastor or Pastors, the Teacher or Teachers of such congregation."

How far the original trust deeds of Cross-street Chapel correspond with the above extract I cannot pretend positively to assert. Mr. Kay, however, admits their agreement in one part, namely, that the "distinctive appellation which the trusts of the chapel recognize" is, "the Presbyterian congregation of Cross-street Chapel;" but he carefully avoids taking notice of the *doctrine* required to be preached within its walls. As Mr. Newcome and the founders of the place agreed in religious sentiment with their brethren of that day;—as the deeds of chapels built about the same time as Cross-street chapel, by the same denomination, very much resemble each other;—and as "Mr. Mottershead found his congregation, about ninety years ago, rigid Calvinists;" there is strong presumptive evidence that the original trusts of the place make provision for the preaching of truths according to the "doctrinal articles of the Church of England," or "the Assembly's Catechism." If, Sir, on enquiry, and I am willing to suppose you have not yet ascertained this fact, you find that my assumption is true in reference to Cross-street Chapel, as well as the "English Presbyterian Chapels" in general, you will not "reluctantly quit occupations of a pleasanter character, to notice the letters under the signature of "Another Orthodox Dissenter," or of any other, because he represents at the possession

of Orthodox Chapels and Endowments by Unitarians, is a "perversion of property to the amount of several thousands annually."

I most sincerely acknowledge, Sir, the rights of conscience in matters of religion, and rejoice that we live in a land, and at a period when any man may publicly worship God in that manner he considers most scriptural. The descendants of Orthodox Presbyterians are fully entitled to embrace and profess the doctrines they think proper, and to lay aside all form of Church discipline if they choose, and to adopt every lawful means for the propagation of their sentiments; but surely, as men of "integrity of conduct," and especially assuming the name of Christians, they ought not to retain places and endowments that were intended by the pious dead for very different purposes. There is a chapel in Yorkshire that was built, some time ago, at the expense of the inhabitants of the township. Lately the majority of the hearers wished to have an Independent Minister, but the minority referring to the trust-deed, found that it required the Church prayers should be read there. This was considered decisive by the majority, who withdrew, and at the expence of 1600*l.* erected another chapel, in which the worship of God is conducted according to the custom of the Independents. If Unitarians, and the present "English Presbyterians," had acted on this *honest* principle, the present controversy would not have existed.

The "English Presbyterians," Sir, of this day, may consider themselves more enlightened, and greater lovers of liberty than their forefathers, and treat with contempt the religious system they loved; but the late Dr. Taylor, of Norwich, who differed from them in doctrinal sentiments, speaks of them in strong terms of commendation. When addressing the Dissenters in Lancashire on a particular occasion, he says: "The ministers ejected in the year 1662, were men prepared to lose all and to suffer martyrdom rather than desert the cause of Civil and Religious Liberty. They were excellent men, because excellent, instant, and fervent in prayer. Those who knew them not might despise

them, but your forefathers, wiser and less prejudiced, esteemed them highly in love for their work's sake. You were once happy in your Heywoods, your *Newcomes*, your Jollies, &c. &c. who left all to follow Christ. But Providence cared for them, and they had great comfort in their ministerial services. The presence and blessing of God appeared in their assemblies, and attended their labours. How many were converted, and built up in godliness and sobriety, by their prayers, pains, doctrines, and conversations! Let my soul for ever be with the souls of these men."\*

Permit me, Sir, to conclude this letter with the following quotation from the venerable John Howe, who, after having fully described the character of Mr. Newcome, concludes thus:—"He was a burning and a shining light! O, Manchester, Manchester! that ancient famed seat of religion and profession, may Capernaum's doom never be thine! May thy Heyrick, Hollingsworth, NEWCOME, and thy neighbours, Angier and Harrison, and divers more, never be witnesses against thee!"

I am, Sir, your's very respectfully,

RICHARD SLATE.

*Stand, near Manchester, Dec. 3rd., 1824.*

*To the Editor of the Manchester Gazette.*

SIR,—The controversy which is now agitated at Manchester between the Orthodox and the Socinians, or as they choose to call themselves, the Unitarians,† has attracted much notice, and excited general interest. The Orthodox question the right of the Socinians to the old Dissenting

\* Dr. Taylor's Scripture Account of Prayer.

† As the name of Presbyterian has been again revived by some of this sect as their distinctive appellation, it may be worth while to show how far one of their own Ministers considers it appropriate. In a sermon preached at the opening of the Renshaw-street chapel, in Liverpool, by Mr. Grundy, the late minister of "The Presbyterian Congregation in Cross-street," there is the following passage:—"Arian and Socinian are the terms generally assigned to us: and these, till lately, were frequently considered as synonymous with Deist or Infidel. The term *Presbyterian* is now commonly used; but, I confess, some difficulty appears to me to

Chapels, because, it is well known, that the founders of those places were hostile to their creed, and, it is presumed, that the trust deeds sanction very different sentiments. In reply, these gentlemen do not produce their trust-deeds, and they are very cautious and backward to give any information about them. Professing to be the friends of free inquiry, they take the liberty of rejecting any opinions, though they may be recorded in the old parchments, and of receiving any other opinions, though they might be held in detestation by their pious ancestors; and, at the same time, they think it right to hold the chapels which those writings were intended to secure, and to enjoy the endowments which those ancestors bequeathed. They say, that whatever might be the original constitution of a place of worship, it must be governed by the will of the majority; and if there are any who do not approve of that government they must submit or secede; and this, they tell us, is the true principle of Protestant dissent. If so, it is natural to ask—what is the authority or use of a trust-deed? what regard is to be paid to the will of a testator? and what security is there for the right occupation of trust property, and the right application of testamentary benefactions? And it is incumbent on our opponents to meet these questions more directly, and to answer them more satisfactorily, than they have yet done. But it is not necessary to expose the illegality and injustice of this principle, as that is already accomplished very successfully by Mr. Hadfield. I wish, rather, to draw the attention of your readers to the following statement of facts.

At Stainland, a populous village in the parish of Halifax, a chapel was built in 1754, by the inhabitants, at their own

*attend the use of it: because, it has either no definite meaning as to opinions or discipline, or if it have any meaning, it signifies something which we are not.* The phrase Rational Christian is, in one respect, objectionable. It is deemed invidious and savouring of pride. Though it ought to be understood, that, when the term is used, it does not mean *rational* as opposed to *irrational*; it denotes persons who make *reason* their guide in *religious* principles and doctrines, in opposition to those who consider religion as an affair of *feeling*. Since we must have some discriminating appellation, would that we could unite in the use of one term, so defined as to include us all, the term *Unitarian*.”



expence, and for their own accommodation, and it was unconnected with any religious denomination. In 1813, part of the congregation wanted an Independent minister to be chosen, and that part were the majority of the seat-holders. But the minority appealed to the trust-deed, which requires that the prayers of the Church of England shall be read. That appeal settled the question. The majority peaceably, and at once, gave up to the minority the chapel, the burying-ground, and all appurtenances ; and incurred the expences of £1700 in building a new chapel.

This seems a case in point. If the Socinians had been in these circumstances, we may infer, from their own representation, that they would have slighted the authority of the trust-deed, and claimed the liberty of avowing contrary sentiments. They would also have said to the opposite party, “ Your appeal to the trust-deed avails nothing ; we have the greater number of votes, and therefore we have a right to govern, but if you are discontented you may withdraw.” The Independents at Stainland, like all Dissenters, exercised the right of private judgment, and claimed the liberty of thinking for themselves, but they also felt the obligation of leaving a place which did not belong to them. They had no idea that a lineal descent from the founders, or that the votes of a majority could subvert the fundamental constitution of a Chapel, or that they could give trust property to those for whom it was never intended ; and they would have stared with astonishment at any man who should have attempted to justify such nefarious conduct by calling it a dissenting principle.

From childhood I have been zealously attached to dissenting principles, but, I confess, Sir, that I am not much disposed to learn them from Socinians ; for, on looking at their services to the dissenting interest, the injuries they have done are much more obvious than the benefits. I am not much disposed to learn dissenting principles from those who have dispersed many a flourishing congregation, and have reduced many a chapel, which was originally built with great difficulty, and at a heavy expence, to a state of desertion

and desolation. Let these gentlemen prove what good they have done to the common cause before they instruct us in the characteristic principles of Nonconformity. In my apprehension, the best teachers of dissenting principles are the men who have demonstrated their attachment to the dissenting interest, not merely by speeches and professions, but by arduous deeds and costly sacrifices ; who fought the battles of freedom, and purchased our privileges at the price of their blood ; who built our chapels, and bequeathed our endowments. They were the men who reduced themselves to poverty, and exposed themselves to reproach, to fines, and to imprisonment, for adhering to the gospel of Christ, and to the rights of Christians. They were honoured by God with extensive usefulness to mankind, and their talents and virtues would have shed a lustre on any community. To them all modern Dissenters are under infinite obligations ; and we should regard them with the reverence and gratitude which are due to the ornaments of human nature, and the benefactors of society.

Happy should we be, were it possible for them to decide the present controversy. In their estimation the intrusion of Socinian preachers into their pulpits, the nullifying of trust-deeds, and the perversion of endowments, would be utterly irreconcilable with every dictate of honour, and every principle of justice. Indeed, could they return from the world of spirits, and visit their former residences, it is impossible to conceive of any thing more calculated to affect their souls with grief and horror than to observe the chilling, withering, ruinous influence of Socinianism on those places for whose establishment and prosperity they prayed and preached, they studied and acted, they exerted their powers and devoted their lives.

According to the lists of chapels which you have published, it appears that they are more numerous in Lancashire than in Yorkshire, though the latter is the larger county, abounds with Dissenters, and contains more places of worship. The difference is remarkable, and may be accounted for. At the time when Dr. Priestley and his friends began to avow

and propagate their sentiments, the Independent Academy was established at Heckmondwike. Of the origin and the principle of that institution, this account is given in the History of Dissenters, vol. 4. p. 276:—"It arose from the pious zeal of a few ministers and public spirited Christians in London, who consulted together on the necessity and the means of dispelling the cloud of Socinian darkness, then spreading over the Northern counties of England. They formed themselves into a society for educating young men for the work of the Ministry in the West Riding of Yorkshire, and in May, 1756, resolved to support an Academy in those parts, and chose James Scott, Minister of Heckmondwike, to superintend the studies of the young men. Justly concluding, that unregenerate Ministers had been the cause of the evil they wished to counteract, they determined to admit no one into their Seminary who did not give a satisfactory account of his experience of the vital change, as well as a declaration of evangelical sentiments." From the commencement of the institution at Heckmondwike, to the present time, the Orthodox Dissenters, in Yorkshire, have never been without an Academy, and now they have two, one at Idle, and another at Rotherham; and there is also a flourishing Baptist Academy, at Bradford. By the zeal and activity of the students and young ministers, who have been educated in these seminaries, besides the formation of many new interests, there have been several old dissenting congregations in the county recovered back to their original principles, and for want of one in Lancashire they have sunk into their present state.

It is gratifying to observe, that this important deficiency is now supplied by the institution at Blackburn. If the friends of orthodoxy in Manchester, and the places adjacent, understand their own interest, and wish to keep up their own cause, they will support that seminary with vigour; and it must be the wish of every subscriber, that the young ministers who are educated there, may imbibe the spirit, and imitate the example of the Henrys and Heywoods, the *Newcomes* and Jollies of former times—that they may ad

here to the Gospel of Christ with the same firmness, adorn it with the same excellence, and propagate it with the same zeal.—I am, Your's, &c.

JOHN COCKIN.

*Holmfirth*, Dec. 9, 1824.

---

*To the Editor of the Manchester Gazette.*

Sir ;—Although my objections to newspaper discussions, which have reference to differences of opinion in religion, continue in full force, if they are not considerably augmented since my former letter, I must again rely upon the patience and candour of your readers for a few observations to which Mr. George Hadfield's letter, in your paper of Saturday last, has given rise.

No one can deprecate more sincerely than myself any censures or reflections on the religious opinions of others ; more especially by those who profess to advocate and assert for themselves the rights of private judgment. You will, therefore, Sir, permit me to express my disapprobation of the intemperate and uncharitable language said to be used at a late dinner, and which would seem to have been the cause of the present discussion. This sentiment of disapprobation I hold in common with the great majority of the religious community with whom I am associated ; and I am sure that your candid and respectable Correspondent, Mr. Birt, will gladly avail himself of the opportunity to entertain a more favourable impression of that body of Dissenters, who, he imagines, have adopted, in an unqualified manner, sentiments and language which he justly condemns.

My only object in obtruding myself upon your readers was to vindicate the religious society with which I am connected, from the serious charge of a wrongful appropriation of property ; to which if we had submitted in silence, it might have been supposed that the charge was well grounded, and that we were afraid to meet it.

Permit me now, Sir, to advert to Mr. Hadfield's letter, a particular examination of which I must decline. How far

Mr. Hadfield, who is a stranger to our Society, one who does not profess to assert any claims, either on his own behalf, or that of any other individual in particular, to the "*ample endowment*" which it has been said, we improperly possess, has a right to put the interrogatories which his letter contains, after the distinct disavowal which I have already given to those enquiries, when propounded by your anonymous Correspondent, on a former occasion, I cheerfully leave to the determination of a discerning public.

It will, I apprehend, be quite sufficient for me to repeat that Cross-street Chapel has no endowment or property of *Orthodox creation*, and that neither is the Chapel itself, nor are any funds connected with it, directly or indirectly, fettered by any restrictions which confine their appropriation to the use of the advocates of any particular articles of Christian faith or doctrine; and that such Chapel and funds are properly applicable in the most extensive *legal* sense, to the Presbyterian Dissenters, who now worship within the chapel walls, whatever may be their sentiments, generally or individually on those points of Christian *faith*, which, sometimes, it is to be feared, to the neglect of Christian *duties*, engage so much of the attention of mere theological disputants.

With this declaration I take leave of your readers, as I must decline being any longer a party in the present controversy, assuring Mr. Hadfield, however, and your correspondent "Another Orthodox Dissenter," that they must bring against us a more powerful train of arguments and facts, than they are possessed of, before they can wrest from us an edifice, which has descended to us from our forefathers, and to which no one has ever disputed our title, before their interference; an interference, I will take leave to say, as unjustifiable, as it was uncalled for.

I am, &c.

SAMUEL KAY.

*To the Editor of the Manchester Gazette.*

SIR;—The unsound character of Socinianism was but imperfectly known to many of your readers until the late enquiry and exposure; and I frankly acknowledge that, previously to my reading the details which have been recently submitted to the public, this was very much the case with myself.

It is now, however, placed beyond contradiction, that the\*

\* The following is an extract from the Sermon of the Rev. George Harris, preached at Bury, June 19th, 1823, viz. "I would seriously put it to the understanding of every individual in this assembly, is it such conduct or the actions of those I have previously glanced at, *which has caused the desertion of many of our chapels, and has occasioned them to fall into the hands of those whom we believe to be the inculcators of most pernicious dogmas?* I am aware that I am touching a very delicate subject. But what I have alluded to is an evil under the sun, and how is this evil to be removed and eradicated unless the causes of its existence be exposed? Concealment here would be useless, and the prophesying of smooth things pernicious in the extreme. Such is not the way for us to excel. Let the sources of evil be ascertained, and then only can the remedy be applied. *I ask then again, is it the bold declaration of unpopular truth, or is it the concealment of that truth which has deprived us of our places of worship? Has any person who in his day and generation boldly preached to his people the word of life, at his decease been succeeded by a Calvinistic divine? Is it in a pulpit in the metropolis from which the pure and unadulterated truths of Christianity have been openly and zealously promulgated, that an Orthodox Candidate is now supplying? No; these deeply to be lamented circumstances have not followed fearless Unitarian preaching, they have not been the consequence of popular plans and measures.* But they are the effects of a conduct the direct reverse. Many of you must be aware of this. Let the causes of these evils be accurately ascertained and stated, *and may the instances which are within our knowledge be to us as beacons warning us against similar shipwreck of the societies over which we have been called to preside, or as members of which we are enrolled.*" The chapels, over the loss of which the preacher is here lamenting, and most of those which he wishes the Unitarians to retain, were built by Calvinists for Calvinistic doctrines!!! He tells us in the preface, that at the Annual Meeting held in the chapel at Bury, the Rev. William Allard in the chair; it was moved by the Rev. John Yates, and seconded by the Rev. J. G. Robberds, that the *most cordial thanks* of the Meeting should be given to the Rev. George Harris for *his very interesting and impressive discourse*; and after dinner at "The Hare and Hounds," on the motion of the Rev. Robert Cree, seconded by the Rev. Henry Clarke, he was unanimously requested to publish it.

majority of these pretended advocates of Christian morality and Christian doctrine, occupy chapels, and subsist upon endowments, designed for the support and propagation of principles directly opposed to those which they maintain ; and further, it appears that much the greater number of their chapels, and of the endowments on those chapels, as well as the monies they obtain from Lady Hewley's estates, are enjoyed by them in direct contravention not only of the intentions of their founders, but also of the law of the land, and of every moral and religious principle.

It is entertaining to hear the Unitarians talk of Presbyterianism, as if none but Presbyterian congregations were admitted into their communion. Was Mr. Jollie, of Sheffield, a Presbyterian? Was the chapel at Rawtonstale ever Presbyterian? Was enquiry ever made as to any denomination to whom a well-endowed chapel belonged previous to its admission amongst their body?

The desolating influence of the professors of these sentiments upon once flourishing dissenting churches and congregations, but which have been reduced by them to wildernesses and deserts, is, indeed, most afflicting ; for whether the endowments upon these chapels, thus obtained by the disciples of Socinus, were raised by persons of their own faith, or by others of the most opposite sentiments, has never been made the subject of inquiry. Chapels so endowed, when once obtained, they have always pertinaciously held, while the endowments, with the aid of Lady Hewley's estates, have frequently made up a salary which has sufficed to keep the minister in, and the people out ; but where such endowments happily did not exist, they deemed the chapels in some cases which I could mention, not worth retaining, and have abandoned them to persons of the same sentiments with the founders of such chapels, and thus the ancient splendour of these places, consisting in a numerous congregation, and in religious improvement, has been happily restored. "*Unitarianism*," says an excellent Correspondent, who has, by sad experience, known and felt its baneful influence, "*is a system that cannot support itself*."

This makes it so lamentable that the property of pious Christians should be made the means of upholding and diffusing those errors which are destructive as far as their influence extends, and which, but for that property, would be confined within a very small circle.”\*

An example of Unitarian *usefulness* in a place which was once in most flourishing circumstances, I will give, in the words of its late minister, himself an Unitarian. “The funds belonging to this place, which have arisen out of the donations, of the wealthy members of the Society from time to time for the use of the minister, and the support of the poor, are very considerable, and are managed by trustees chosen in succession out of the congregation. They have eight alms-houses, which are liberally endowed, and in which poor widows reside; funds for the education of young men for the ministry, for the instruction of the children of the poor, and other very important charities. *The congregation, though respectable, is not large, the opinions of the Unitarians being by no means popular in this part of the kingdom.*”

Will the reader believe that this refers to the chapel where Matthew Henry once dispensed the word of life to crowds, who hung upon his lips, from which flowed religious knowledge and instruction to refresh and gladden the Church—that from this place (Chester,) “sounded out the word of the Lord, and in every place their faith to Godward was spread abroad.”

And what has it now become under the enlightening system of Unitarianism? The place is beautiful and lovely even in its ruins and ashes! The impress of Matthew Henry’s image, in faint but fairest lines, is still upon it, although its glory is gone. It still has its alms-houses for poor widows—its funds for the instruction of young men for the ministry,

\* Mr. Harris in his Sermon already referred to, states that the Lancashire Unitarians, who are probably near a fourth of the entire sect in England, Scotland, and Wales, *raise for religious purposes only about 3500l.*, exclusive of Endowments!!! He, therefore, candidly declares to his hearers, “*You will perceive that we are most lamentably deficient.*”



and also for the instruction of the children of the poor, and other important charities, intended (as Dr. Colton said of Lady Hewley's liberality, in the funeral sermon which he preached on the occasion of her death,) "to perpetuate and perfume the names of their founders in the church—to continue their serviceableness upon earth—and to excite others to an imitation of them." But there Unitarianism, like the mildew, has seized upon the whole, and spoiled alike the ancient renown and present usefulness. Is every Unitarian bosom so steeled against the best interests of humanity as to refuse its pity at the desolations which his own principles have inflicted upon this once interesting but now fallen and forsaken spot? The pathetic language of the captive Jews admirably conveys the sentiments of Christian sympathy on this afflicting subject,—"*We wept when we remembered Zion. We hung our harps upon the willows. If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning. If I do not remember thee, let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth.*"

The truth and justice of these complaints are most strikingly evinced upon a much larger scale in the present circumstances of that noble district—the county of York. There the Unitarians possess every possible advantage.—There is their Academy.—There once laboured Dr. Priestley.—There they have obtained possession of the Estates of Lady Hewley, designed for purposes most opposite to those to which the "lofty principles" of the present Trustees choose, in their discretion, (a discretion unsanctioned by the law) to appropriate those Estates. With all these advantages, what has Socinianism there done? What uncultivated ground has it occupied and improved? What has it done for the instruction of the people at large, in any way commensurate with these immense advantages?

Surely the impotency of error was never so strikingly displayed! Whilst every denomination of Orthodox Christians has enlarged its boundaries and increased its influence at home, and in all parts of the globe, by means of Missions, these men have done—what? Ever since that great county,

now containing above a million of souls “was yet fresh from the hands of the Creator,” they have built the *two* little chapels at Thorne and Stainforth, united under *one* minister! This (excluding the two old chapels purchased by the Unitarian Baptists, who are a distinct sect) is all they have originated! The remaining *sixteen* chapels which they possess in that county and where they disseminate their principles, they occupy in direct opposition to the sentiments of the founders of those chapels, and against law, justice, and equity, upon which the sacred rights of property are founded.

It is obvious, then, that the professors of Socinian doctrines in their dealings with trust property, are not, and dare not, be faithful to the trusts and intentions of the founders. The moment they resolve upon making a just restitution of the property which they have unrighteously obtained, and appropriate it to its legitimate purposes, that very moment they decree their own extinction as a sect.

No man who venerates the rights of conscience, and the principles of religious liberty, can be indifferent to the statement of my friend Mr. Cockin.—The want of success to Unitarian efforts he attributes—not to the strength of prejudice—not to the spirit of persecution—not to the secular power—nothing of this sort. He accounts for it all, by the establishment of dissenting academies—by moral means and the force of truth alone. He would I will venture to assert, be as indignant at the employment of other means as he has shewn himself to be against those attempts which have been made to call the violation of Trust Deeds by the name of “Dissenting principles.”

In this county, of an almost equal population with Yorkshire, the same advantages have not been enjoyed, and consequently in upwards of thirty pulpits, surreptitiously obtained and unjustly and illegally held, and from which Orthodox principles were at one time faithfully promulgated to large congregations, Unitarian morality is now taught and inculcated; and these are now become what Mr. Harris justly describes as “the half-way houses to infidelity.” If a correct account of most of these chapels could be obtained,

a sad scene of ruinous desolation would be developed, of which the public is little aware, and which would clearly shew that the endowments provided by Orthodox Christians of past ages, instead of proving advantageous to the cause for which they made these costly sacrifices, have, by falling into the present hands, proved to be curses instead of blessings. There is much truth in the remark of Mr. Harris, who, notwithstanding all that has been said, has far more reason to complain of his friends than of his opponents. "I have no doubt," says he, "that in building and endowing chapels they (the Orthodox of former days) were actuated by upright, and pious, and benevolent motives. But I may be allowed to say, that I am sorry they did endow them, because I look upon endowments as prejudicial to the cause of dissent, to tend to indifference and lukewarmness, and to produce endless vexation." Unhappily *the cause of dissent* has not been the only sufferer by the present misappropriation of these chapels and endowments, though that has been deeply dishonoured by it, but the cause of vital religion, and the best interests of men, have suffered in an infinitely greater degree.

Difficult indeed has been the undertaking of the Gentlemen who have appeared as the advocates of these proceedings. Mr. Turner informed them "their unmitigated task, according to their own statement, was, to prove that the property of truth belonged to error." I was confident the two gentlemen who have since appeared before the public, would not long advocate such a cause as this, and the result has shewn I was not mistaken. One of those Gentlemen, I am informed from several sources, has elsewhere recorded his sentiments against the principle I now complain of: and the other, (Mr. Kay) with his usual candour and manliness, has admitted "*that he must decline a particular examination of my former letter,*" and, also, "*that he must decline being any longer a party to the present controversy.*" In plain English he acknowledges that he can neither maintain the accuracy of his former opinions, nor dispute the correctness of mine. Indeed the subdued tone

which pervades the whole of his last communication must be obvious to every reader. In his former address Mr. Kay, with all the glee of anticipated victory, invites and even challenges us to institute legal proceedings:—"Our congregation," says he "is ready to meet them without fear:" but now, so shaken is his confidence either in his clients or his cause, that he cannot sufficiently deprecate any attempt on our part to disturb their possession and almost implores us to forbear.

There is, therefore, very little in Mr. Kay's letter which it is material to answer. He now says, "I apprehend it will be quite sufficient for me to repeat that Cross-street Chapel has no endowment or property of *Orthodox creation*." His former letter stated, that "Cross-street Chapel has no endowment at all coeval with its foundation, *nor has it any auxiliary funds, but such as owe their origin to some of the present generation*."

I am perfectly sure that Mr. Kay would not intentionally mislead, but his letters have evidently been got up in haste, and abound with errors, and therefore we cannot so implicitly rely on his accuracy as he seems to expect. I still think he is mistaken in reference to the particular endowment before referred to, and, in addition to this, Mr. Aston, in his picture of Manchester, p. 158. says, the interest of the following sums, some of them, at least, given in Orthodox times, is distributed to the poor who frequent the Chapel at Cross-street: namely, by Lady Mosley, in 1697, 50*l*.; by Nathaniel Gaskell, in 1716, 50*l*.; by various benefactors, in 1739, 100*l*.; by Thomas Butterworth, in 1742, 100*l*.; by Daniel Bayley, in 1761, 50*l*.; and by Josiah Birch, 1781, 50*l*. Mr. Aston has not told us whether the interest of the two sums of 500*l*. and 100*l*. given by Ann Butterworth, in 1735, and Daniel Bayley, in 1762, goes to the poor of Cross-street Chapel, but Mr. Kay will probably inform us how it is appropriated: and some of these dates, at least, are "Orthodox." I apprehend, however, that Mr. Kay will, at once admit, that Lady Mosley *was orthodox in the year 1697*, two years after the death of

Mr. Newcome, and during the ministry of \*Mr. Chorlton, and that these benevolent persons, who thus provided for the poor of Cross-street congregation, *are no longer numbered amongst "the present generation."*

Mr. Kay's anxiety to clear the Cross-street Chapel of the supposed charge of applying "Orthodox" endowments to "Socinian" purposes, does him great honour and deserves better success: and whenever the question is, as I trust it soon will be, agitated by the Trustees, for whom he is Solicitor, whether the Chapel itself shall be given up to the purposes for which it was originally bought and paid for by Mr. Newcome and his friends, I trust he will do full justice to so honourable a principle.

He further says, that *"the chapel is not, directly or indirectly, fettered by any restrictions which confine its appropriation to the use of the advocates of any particular Articles of Christian faith or doctrine, and such chapel is properly applicable, in the most extended legal sense, to the Presbyterian Dissenters who now worship within the chapel walls, whatever (mark reader!) may be their sentiments generally or individually on points of Christian faith!?"*

Was there ever such another deed drawn as this is said to be? If this be a correct statement, then the property may be demanded by the Roman Catholics or by any other sect, who are quite as much *Presbyterians* as the present congregation; there may be a contest every Sabbath for the possession of the Pulpit and Pews by any sect or party whatever: but these opinions of Mr. Kay (for they are only his opinions, and as such I treat them) are most egregiously unfounded. In my opinion, there is not a chapel thus circumstanced in the kingdom.

The single question in dispute is this: Do the Trustees of Cross-street Chapel act legally in appropriating to the maintenance of Socinian doctrines and the use of a congregation which totally disclaims the Presbyterian form of Church

\* Mr. Chorlton dedicated his funeral Sermon for Mr. Newcome to this excellent Lady, of whom he speaks in very high terms.

Government, that property which in or about the year 1693 was settled in Trust for the sole benefit of a Presbyterian congregation and for the preaching of the Orthodox faith exclusively?—Now while I admit that the present congregation, or any other, may avail themselves of this Chapel by introducing the Presbyterian discipline, and an Orthodox ministry, I, at the same time, utterly deny, upon Mr. Kay's own statement, that the Trustees have any right to permit Unitarian doctrines to be preached in that Chapel, or that the present congregation is Presbyterian.

Mr. Kay, however, with singular inconsistency, persists in calling this congregation "*Presbyterian*;" but, I apprehend, that the late minister of Cross-street Chapel, Mr. Grundy, is as good a judge of this matter as Mr. Kay; and what says he? "The term Presbyterian is now used (*i. e.* by his fellow Unitarians) but I confess some difficulty appears to me to attend the use of it, because it has either no definite meaning as to *opinions or discipline*, or if it have any meaning, it signifies something WHICH WE ARE NOT." Thus, Mr. Kay's own minister, and religious teacher, and the minister and teacher of the congregation, which, in spite of itself, he still insists is "*Presbyterian*," tells him he is wrong; and, upon this authority alone, it is plain, the Trustees are now misapplying the trust property.

How Mr. Grundy could consistently preach Socinian doctrines in a Chapel which had been erected for Orthodox sentiments, and Presbyterian discipline, it is no business of mine to explain, nor, if it were, could I perform the task to my own satisfaction, or, to the conviction of others; but I think he would have shown better taste, and a sounder judgment, if he had withheld his boast, at the late Unitarian Dinner, of the liberality of the Trustees of Cross-street Chapel, for the services of himself and his colleague, in a Chapel which was built by the friends of Mr. Newcome, for the promulgation of their own principles, to which his are confessedly and diametrically opposed.

The reason why Mr. Kay perseveres in the use of the term "*Presbyterian*" is quite obvious, although the new

Meeting House in Salford is called "*Unitarian*;" the Chapel in Mosley-street (Mr. Taylor's) is called "*Unitarian*;" the sentiments of the minister of Cross-street Chapel, we are told, are not Presbyterian, either in opinion or discipline, but "*Unitarian*;"—still he calls the congregation "Presbyterian." It is clear he has been rambling amongst the "venerable parchments," and finds that "this is the only distinctive appellation which the trusts of the Chapel recognise," as they were drawn up by Mr. Newcome and his friends about the year 1693, and, therefore, he adheres to the name though the principles of that denomination and the intentions of the founders of the Chapel are now totally disregarded.

Mr. Kay has chosen to rely upon the act of Toleration passed in the year 1688, in support of the present Socinian ministry, and thereby he has admitted, as the fact is, that there was no other authority under which this Chapel built in 1693 could be legally settled in trust. This act, however, expressly provides, as I have formerly stated, that no "ease, benefit or advantage should be thereby given to any person that should *deny, in his preaching or writing, the doctrine of the blessed Trinity.*" Now, the present minister denies that doctrine, and, I ask, by what right the Trustees permit him to use that Pulpit, and occupy that Chapel, and possess the emoluments thereof under a Deed, dated in or about the year 1693, being only five years after this act passed, and under the authority of which alone the Chapel could be legally settled in trust at all?

The inevitable inference is, that the Chapel is legally settled for the purpose of promoting Orthodox doctrines, as Mr. Newcome and his friends, unquestionably intended it should be. Of that intention there is, indeed, abundant evidence and none more satisfactory than that of Mr. Kay himself, the Solicitor of this Chapel, and a friend of the doctrines now preached there, and therefore all admissions by him are invaluable. He has candidly admitted that for the space of forty years after its foundation, and long after that, the congregation were "rigid Calvinists," and therefore no

one can doubt what were the intentions of the founders of this Chapel.

In every point of view, therefore, *the Chapel is legally and justly applicable to the purposes designed by its founders*; and I hope that the Trustees will see the justice of this, and that such of the congregation as may feel dissatisfied with an Orthodox ministry will provide for themselves elsewhere, as all other Dissenters do in similar circumstances. "Trust property is not left to *persons* to do what they please with it, but for *purposes* which are to be promoted by it; and when persons cannot, or will not, devote it to those purposes, they ought, in common honesty to relinquish all connection with it." This is the opinion of my friend, Mr. Turner, in which every man will concur, unless he thinks that "it is in religious concerns alone, that no regard is to be paid to the views and wishes of the dead."

An attempt has been made, in the course of this controversy, by the advocates of the Socinians, to justify the retention of these Chapels on some supposed, but undefined, dissenting principle. I confess I should like to hear what that principle is, which no person, but a Socinian, either understands or acknowledges. I have certainly heard of it before, but it came from the same source—the Socinians. At the Wolverhampton Chapel, which was originally orthodox, on the resignation of the minister, the majority of the congregation, in the year 1781, chose Mr. Jameson, a decided Calvinist, to succeed him, *and he removed to Wolverhampton with his family and furniture*, but the minority, consisting of a few Socinians, locked and guarded the doors of the Meeting-house against him, without any notice having been given to him; and no admittance could be gained without having recourse either to violence or to legal measures. Mr. Jameson, being a man of a peaceable disposition, would not suffer the former to be resorted to: and the want of means, and the heavy expenses thrown upon his friends, prevented their having recourse to the latter; they therefore fitted up a barn for a temporary accommodation; and in this way Socinianism triumphed in the Chapel at



that time. *Thirteen* ministers of that persuasion, in a recent publication, call this expulsion of the majority from the Chapel to the barn "*quietly retiring and acquiescing.*"—Whereupon, they say, "*the Meeting-house, with all its appurtenances, upon the universally admitted principles of Protestant Dissenters, became the rightful property of those who remained, and upon these just and sacred principles of Christian liberty, the principles upon which it was first formed the congregation continued to assemble.*"

A more impudent slander upon Dissenting principles was surely never uttered! The friends of these "just and sacred principles," have, however, been compelled to make restitution of the Chapel, and the suit with them has settled a legal principle, which will undoubtedly sooner or later, lead to most important results.

In opposition to the sentiments of these men, I have great pleasure in giving the opinion of a man who is unquestionably one of the most able and eloquent champions of religious liberty of the present day. In a letter, with which he has favoured me, he says, "At this controversy (in Manchester) and the complete exposure of Unitarian delinquencies, I have great delight. I would die rather than utter a calumny against the persons of Unitarians, or raise a forceful finger to prevent, by persecution, the promulgation even of the doctrines they conscientiously believe. But I have always entertained and defended the opinion, now publicly and well expressed, that their appropriation to their worship of edifices and funds raised for other purposes is degrading to their body, and is an unworthy and fraudulent perversion which they can never defend,"—I am, Sir,

Your obedient Servant.

GEORGE HADFIELD.

## APPENDIX.

No. I.



A LIST of the CHAPELS in ENGLAND, WALES,  
and SCOTLAND, which with their ENDOWMENTS  
are now appropriated to the propagation of the  
SOCINIAN DOCTRINES.



N. B.—The Design of the following List, is to illustrate the justice and importance of the great Principle which this Publication is designed to advocate; *viz.* That in the administration of property invested in Trust, the intentions and purposes of the Founders, should in all cases, be inviolably maintained.

The Editors beg most distinctly to state, not only that there are in this List, no intentional inaccuracies, but that every possible effort has been made to have it perfectly correct. Yet they are aware that owing to the great difficulty of such an undertaking, there may be, after all their pains, some incorrectness and deficiencies. In case of a republication, they will be happy in the opportunity of rectifying every mistake and supplying every deficiency; or it will give them pleasure if some one who is perfectly informed on the subject, should complete what they have thus begun. It is scarcely necessary to add, that even supposing

some mistakes with respect to particular cases may exist, that circumstance will have no effect to invalidate the principle, or to diminish the force of the general statements.

The information on which this list is formed, closes for the most part with the year 1824.



## ENGLAND.

---

### CAMBRIDGESHIRE.

WISBEACH.—*Originally Orthodox.*

---

### CHESHIRE.

ALLOSTOCK, near Knutsford.—*Originally Orthodox.*—Built about the year 1700. There is an estate of twenty-seven acres at Rainow, near Macclesfield, belonging to it, which was purchased with property left for that purpose by the Rev. S. Garside, the second minister, who was unquestionably of Orthodox sentiments. There is also a smaller endowment—A small congregation, attached to the peculiarities of the late Mr. Cudworth got possession of the place upwards of thirty years ago. The Unitarians at some neighbouring places, had a trial at law with them, and were foiled, but withheld the endowments. They have, however, lately agreed with the preacher, who is very aged, to accept of a share in the endowments, in consideration of which he has surrendered the chapel to them. It is now held by the Unitarian minister at Knutsford, but there is in fact, no Unitarian congregation whatever at this place. What became of the Endowment during the twenty-years

it was withheld from the old minister cannot be ascertained.

Mr. J. Ashton, (the Unitarian Minister, at Knutsford) who enjoys the endowment settled upon this chapel, for preaching occasionally without having any regular congregation to hear him, has inserted a letter in the Monthly Repository in explanation of his conduct, and contends that “no class of Christians should be put to the slightest inconvenience or hardship, or be visited with the least obloquy, because, in the exercise of their unquestionable right to think for themselves, it is their fortune to think in certain respects differently from ancestors *to whose piety they and their fathers have been indebted for some of their religious accommodations and advantages.*” This is Mr. Ashton’s apology for the perversion of this chapel and its endowments, and the Chapel and endowments at Knutsford also, which this Unitarian pluralist enjoys. He acknowledges that his “very humble, but well-intentioned exertions,” at Allostock have been attended “with little success” which he attributes to “the character of the neighbourhood,” and *says nothing of the endowment.*

ALTRINCHAM.—*Built by the Unitarians in 1814.*—The minister at Hale Barns Chapel officiates also at this place.

CHESTER.—*Originally Orthodox.*—Built for the celebrated Mr. Matthew Henry and his congregation, about the year 1700. In this chapel a copy of Mr. Henry’s Exposition of the Bible has been placed on desks, for general perusal, probably ever since its first publication. A gentleman who visited the chapel, some years ago, observed that one of the volumes on the New Testament was missing, and that several leaves were torn out of another, while the New Unitarian Version was in the pulpit, and in several of the pews.

CONGLETON.—*Originally Orthodox.*—This interest was founded by the adherents of two very godly ejected ministers, Mr. Moxon and Mr. Machin. It is believed that the

congregation held Orthodox sentiments at the time when the present chapel was built, A. D. 1740. It is endowed with a house, or houses and land, and with some other property. The houses and land, it is understood, were given by persons of Orthodox views; the other property was left, more recently, by a minister of Unitarian sentiments.

CROSS-STREET, near Altrincham.—*Originally Orthodox*.—Endowment forty pounds, *per annum*. Usual number of hearers eight.

DEAN-ROW, near Wilmslow.—*Originally Orthodox*.—Built in 1693.

DUCKINFIELD.—*Originally Orthodox*.—Built A. D. 1707, for the congregation of the eminent Mr. Samuel Angier, the friend of Dr. Owen. There is a freehold estate of thirty three acres, belonging to it, left by Mr. James Haywood, an Orthodox Dissenter, and one of the founders of the chapel.

HALE BARNS.—*Originally Orthodox*.—Built upwards of a century ago. See Altrincham.

HYDE.—*Originally Orthodox*.

KNUTSFORD.—*Originally Orthodox*.—Built in 1689. Mr. Tong, the biographer of Mr. Henry, was with this people at the time of erecting the chapel, but left them shortly afterwards for a situation at Coventry. There is a very pleasing and particular account of the origin of this interest in his Life of Henry.

MACCLESFIELD.—*Originally Orthodox*.—Built in 1692. There are many interesting particulars respecting this place also in Tong's life of Henry. The Congregation is almost extinct.

MIDDLEWICH.—The Chapel here was *Originally Orthodox*, and was endowed; but it passed into the hands of the Unitarians, and in order to entitle the late Rev. John Phillips, then the minister of a Chapel at Kingsley, to the endowment or funds for preaching at Middlewich, it became necessary to hire a Congregation of a few persons to attend, at the rate of eight-pence *per diem*. Since his death the chapel has been converted into cottages, but our correspond-

ent cannot inform us how the rents and endowments are now applied.

NANTWICH.—*Originally Orthodox*.—Present chapel built 1719. The excellent Mr. Samuel Lawrence, who was the bosom friend of Mr. Henry, was one of the earliest ministers of this Congregation.—See Tong's Life of Henry.

STOCKPORT.—*Originally Orthodox*.—Built in 1722. Scarcely any hearers remain.

WILLINGTON, near Delamere.—*Built by the Unitarians* in 1823.

---

## DERBYSHIRE.

ASHFORD.—*Originally Orthodox*.—The old Chapel at Ashford was built for that celebrated Nonconformist Divine, Mr. William Bagshaw, usually called "the Apostle of the Peak." The eminent Mr. John Ashe, whose life was published by Dr. Clegg, was successor to Mr. Bagshaw, at this place. The chapel, however, has been almost wholly rebuilt, and also endowed, by two gentlemen of Anti-Trinitarian sentiments.

BELPER.—The congregation here was *originally Orthodox*; but the present chapel was built entirely by a gentleman of Unitarian sentiments. The congregation probably owes its rise to the preaching of Mr. Samuel Charles, M. A., who was ejected from the neighbouring parish of Mickleover, and, according to Calamy, preached at Belper.

BRADWELL.—*Originally Orthodox*.—The congregation at Bradwell was also gathered by the labours of Mr. W. Bagshaw, for whom the first Meeting-house was built. Mr. Kelsall, a most excellent Independent Minister, who laboured here for fifty years, and who had acquired some property by a share in a mine, built the present commodious Chapel.

**BUXTON.**—*Originally Orthodox.*—There is a house belonging to this Chapel, now let as an inn, for 40*l. per annum*, and which was built by the last stated Minister, of whose sentiments it is difficult to speak, but who is thought to have been an Arian. It is supposed to have been built on the site of an old house belonging to the chapel. It is understood that there are other funds belonging to this place. But as there are no persons of Unitarian sentiments in Buxton, or the neighbourhood, the chapel is shut up, except occasionally in the bathing season.

**CHESTERFIELD.**—*Originally Orthodox.*—The interest here was raised by the labours of Mr. John Billingsley, an eminent ejected minister. The chapel was built in 1694, at the expense of Cornelius Clarke, Esq. of Norton. Socinian tenets were introduced here subsequently to 1742.

**DERBY.**—*Originally Orthodox.*—Built in 1679. It has a small endowment, but the testator is thought to have been an Arian.

**DUFFIELD.**—Built chiefly at the expense of a gentleman of Arian or Unitarian sentiments.

**FINDERN.**—*Originally Orthodox.*—Liberally endowed; but it is understood that the congregation had become Arian before the endowment was founded.

**HUCKLOW.**—*Originally Orthodox.*—The congregation at this place, is one of those which were founded by Mr. John Ashe. The excellent Mr. Robert Kelsall divided his labours, for many years, between this place and Bradwell. The chapel has been taken down and rebuilt since the congregation became Unitarian.

**ILKISTON.**—The particulars of the origin of this chapel are unknown to our Derbyshire correspondent; but as it was erected very early in the last century, there is scarcely a doubt that it was *Originally Orthodox.*—It is liberally endowed. Mr. Grundy who has lately removed from Manchester to Liverpool, was minister at this chapel from 1808 to 1811.

**LEA WOOD.**—Built by a gentleman of Unitarian sentiments.

MIDDETON STONEY.—*Originally Orthodox*.—This place has several small endowments.

NORTON.—*Originally Orthodox*.—Mr. H. H. Piper, who formerly professed Orthodox sentiments preaches here. He was for some time a student in Hoxton Academy, and afterwards at Homerton Academy, and now preaches at Norton, under the fostering care of two of Lady Hewley's Trustees.

RIPLEY.—A modern chapel built by the Unitarians.

## DEVONSHIRE.

COLLUMPTON.—*Originally Orthodox*.—The first minister was the Rev. W. Crompton, M. A., who was ejected in 1662. He was succeeded in 1698 by the Rev. R. Evans who continued there upwards of forty years until his death. He was the grandfather of the venerable R. Evans, of Appledore, who died in 1824.

COLYTON.—*Originally Orthodox*.—The first minister was the Rev. John Keridge, M. A. who was ejected from Lyme, Dorset. He died in 1705. About a century ago the congregation divided, and for a time worshipped in two places. For many years however there has been but one, and that is extremely reduced.

CREDITON.—*Originally Orthodox*.—The first ministers were the Rev. John Pope and Robert Carel, who were ejected in 1662. About the beginning of the last century Josiah Eveleigh became the minister. He was thoroughly Orthodox and published a Tract in defence of the Divinity of Christ, entitled "The Church's Rock." At that time the present Meeting house which is a very large one was erected. He was succeeded by Micaiah Towgood, who continued there for twelve years during which time he was Orthodox, and then removed to Exeter. His successor Mr. Berry degenerated to Arianism, and the congregation



gradually diminished, so that at present scarcely any hearers remain. The endowments are large.

EXETER.—*Originally Orthodox*.—There were originally three Meeting-houses here, but the congregations were united and the ministers preached interchangeably at the different places. One of the ministers, the Rev. John Lavington, was a zealous champion for the truth at the time of the celebrated controversy on the doctrine of the Trinity which originated in the defection of Messrs. Pierce and Hallet to Arianism. The endowments are large.

HONITON.—*Originally Orthodox*.—Several of the ejected ministers appear to have preached here subsequently to 1662. The Rev. John Ball who settled here about the close of the seventeenth century published some pamphlets in opposition to the new style of preaching which was getting into vogue among the Dissenters in the West about 1730. He died in 1745 in the 91st year of his age, having been minister at Honiton above fifty years.

LYMPSTONE.—*Originally Orthodox*.—The first minister the Rev. Samuel Tapper who was ejected in 1662 and died in 1709. His successors Joseph Manston and Ebenezer Hancock, were both Orthodox. The latter died in 1757.

MORETON HAMPSTEAD.—*Originally Orthodox*.—The first minister the Rev. Robert Woolcombe was ejected in 1662 and died 1692. His successor was Mr. Angel who died in 1721, and was succeeded by Micajah Towgood, who removed hence to Crediton in 1736.

PLYMOUTH.—*Originally Orthodox*.—The Rev. Nathaniel Jacob who was ejected in 1662 and died in 1690 was the first minister. He was succeeded by Nathaniel Harding who remained there till his death in 1744.

SIDMOUTH. — *Originally Orthodox*. — There were two ministers at this place in 1715 the Rev. Messrs. Stevenson and Palk who were both Orthodox. The former removed soon after to Bath, and the latter after many years to South Molton.

TAVISTOCK.—*Originally Orthodox*.—The Rev. Henry Flamank, an ejected minister who died in 1692, was suc-

ceeded by Jacob Saundercock also Orthodox, who died in 1729.

TOTNESS.—*Originally Orthodox*.—The first ministers were the Rev. Francis Whiddon and John Galpine, both ejected in 1662.

## DORSETSHIRE.

BRIDPORT.—*Originally Orthodox*.—Existed at an early period of tolerated Dissent, and continued for a long time decidedly evangelical. The old Meeting-house was taken down and rebuilt about thirty years ago.

DORCHESTER.—*Originally Orthodox*.—This cause dates from the Ejection under Charles II. and the place was decidedly Orthodox until little more than fifty years ago. On the withdrawal of the evangelical doctrine many of the hearers went off to Lady Huntingdon's Chapel, and the congregation is now very small.

POOLE.—*Originally Orthodox*.—Built in 1705 and enlarged in 1720. Sixty-eight years ago a separation took place and the minister withdrew with sixty or eighty of the people. His successor was an Arian though *all* the people were avowedly Orthodox. The congregation is *very small*.

## DURHAM.

STOCKTON.—*Originally Orthodox*.—The excellent John Rogers, M. A. (See Non-conformist's Memorial, Vol. I. p. 379.) licensed a place at Stockton, in 1672. The first resident minister was Thomas Thompson, a student of Mr. Frankland's, who was ordained July 11, 1688. A chapel was erected and opened here July 21, 1699. Mr. Thompson died Nov. 24, 1729, having been minister here nearly forty-one years. He was succeeded by his son Mr. John Thompson, who died in 1753. Mr. Andrew Blackie his

successor is believed to have been an Arian. In 1754 the chapel was rebuilt. There are endowments upon it. One of the ministers of this place, who for several years had been a preacher of Unitarianism, having avowed himself a Trinitarian, was discharged and ejected by a legal process about six years ago.

SUNDERLAND.—Recently built by Unitarians.

## ESSEX.

COLCHESTER.—*Originally Orthodox.*

SAFFRON WALDEN.—*Originally Orthodox.* Lately rebuilt. Endowment about 200*l. per annum.* The congregation a mere handful.

STRATFORD.—Recently built by Unitarians.

WALTHAMSTOW.—*Originally Orthodox.*—Built by the late Mr. Coward, the friend of Watts and Doddridge about 1733. The first minister the Rev. Hugh Farmer a learned writer on Miracles, Demoniacs, &c.

## GLOUCESTERSHIRE.

BRISTOL.—Built by the Unitarians.

CIRENCESTER.—*Originally Orthodox.*

FRENCHAY.—*Ditto.*

GLOUCESTER.—The meeting in Barton Street, Gloucester, was built in 1699 for the Rev. James Forbes, of whom an account may be seen in Palmer's Nonconformist Memorial, under the article, "Gloucester Cathedral."

He was succeeded by Mr. Denham who was also sound in the faith.

Next came Dr. Hodge, reputed an Arian, who was

succeeded by Mr. Dickenson, from Yorkshire, a Baxterian, but long before he died, he resigned his ministry, but continued to live in the Parsonage House. Messrs. Tremlet, Aubrey, and Brown, all of whom were considered Socinians, followed Mr. Dickinson in succession, and the congregation sunk from 200 or 300 to 20 or 30. Between one and two years it has been shut up.

The Endowments are,—

1. A Parsonage House, given by Mr. Brown (not the last preacher) but one of their members early in the last century, who also gave
2. An Estate, at Upton St. Leonard's, three miles from Gloucester, which one of the late Trustees sold to himself for eight hundred pounds which he bought into the funds.
3. 200*l.* sterling, left by — Wade, Esq., of Pud-Hill, near Nailsworth, who died between thirty and forty years ago.
4. 200*l.* sterling was left by Miss Olivers, who died since Mr. Wade, and were hearers of Mr. Tremlet.

MARSHFIELD.—The following is an extract from a paper printed and published at Marshfield, Dec. 21, 1819. “It appears from authentic documents that after the persecution which disgraced the age of Charles the Second, and the misguided zeal which marked the course of the Bartholomew Act, there was a worthy Dissenting Minister, named Seal, who preached the doctrines contained in the thirty-nine Articles of the Established Church, and which our venerable bishops the reformers, sealed with their blood. Mr. Seal lived and preached from 1680 till the Revolution, when William and Mary ascended the throne: his manuscript sermons assert the doctrines of the Atonement, Justification by Faith, and the Divinity of Christ.

That the Dissenters of that day were Independents, appears by the certificate granted by the magistrates, August 8, 1699; whereby they were permitted to worship God in the house of Charles Rudder.

The different trust deeds of later dates which convey the

legacies, speak of the Dissenters as Independents or Presbyterians, *terms which in those times they seemed to consider as synonymous.*

About the year 1752, the old meeting-house was built by public subscription, and is now used by the Unitarians. The lease, release, and trust deed, bear date June, 1752. These deeds declare as follow: "That the meeting-house was erected for the use of the Independents or Presbyterians; that ten trustees shall be appointed from age to age, who shall manage the affairs of the society, and keep a proper book of accounts, rules, and so forth; which book shall be binding against the ministers and trustees. That when death, or refusal to act, or removal beyond five miles from Marshfield, shall take away five of the said trustees, then the remaining trustees, with the minister, shall choose five persons from among the congregation, to supply the deficiency."

Soon after the meeting-house was built, the minister and principal persons gradually embraced the Arian doctrine concerning Christ; and still receding from the sentiments of their predecessors, at length became Unitarians, and followers of the late Dr. Priestley.

## HAMPSHIRE.

NEWPORT, ISLE OF WIGHT.—Built by Unitarians.

PORTSMOUTH (High-street)—*Originally Orthodox.*

(St. Thomas's-street)—*Do.*                      Liberally  
endowed.

RINGWOOD.

*Do.*

## HERTFORDSHIRE.

ST. ALBANS.—*Originally Orthodox*.—Founded A. D. 1690. One of the earliest ministers was Mr. Grew, for whom Mr. John Heywood (son of Oliver Heywood) who was chaplain to Mr. Marsh, of Gorson, often preached. Mr. Grew was succeeded by Samuel Clark, D. D. (a lineal descendant of the well known Samuel Clark, ejected from St. Benet Fisk, London) a great friend of Dr. Doddridge. He founded the first Dissenting Charity School out of London, about 1710. He was followed by his son-in-law Rev. Jabez Hinos for about sixty years, who inclined to Arianism. The present minister decidedly Socinian.

---

 KENT.

BESSELS GREEN.—*Originally Orthodox*.

CANTERBURY.— *Do.*

CHATHAM.— *Do.*

DEPTFORD.— *Do.*

DOVER.— *Do.*

MAIDSTONE.— *Do.*

ROCHESTER.— *Do.* Almost extinct.

TENTERDEN.— *Do.* Large Endowments.

The Editors regret they have not the means of giving a more complete history of the chapels in this county.

## LANCASHIRE.

BLAKELEY, near Manchester. — Mr. Thomas Pyke, ejected from Ratcliffe Church preached at this place when Charles issued his indulgences in 1672, and was very useful in the conversion of souls. He was a faithful and orthodox minister. When his end drew near he said to those about him, that he found the best preparations of the best men were little enough when they came to die. He died in July, 1676, about fifty-four years of age. O. Heywood, in his occasional visits to Lancashire, sometimes preached here. Mr. Brooks, who was ordained June 18, 1700, at Macclesfield, when Mr. Matthew Henry was one of the ordainers, is called Mr. Brooks, of Blakeley, and probably preached here at that time. Mr. John Heywood who was ordained at Warrington, June 16, 1702, was minister at Blakeley, in 1709, and died here in 1731. Later ministers of this place are Messrs. Valentine, Berm, Pope, afterwards tutor at the Socinian College Hackney, and Harrison. This place is endowed but by whom and to what amount the writer does not know.

BOLTON-LE-MOORS.—Bank Chapel. Mr. W. Tong, author of the life of Matthew Henry, and of a Preface to Mr. Samuel Bourn's Sermons, says of this town, "it has been an ancient and famed seat of religion. At the first dawn of the Reformation the day spring from on high visited that place and the adjacent villages, and by the letters which we have of those brave martyrs, Mr. Bradford and Mr. George Marsh, it will appear what persons and families in that neighbourhood had so early received the gospel in its purity and simplicity; and it has often been a pleasure to me to observe, that it still continues in several of those families, and *it will be their greatest honour never to depart from it.*" Mr. Godwin, Vicar of Bolton, was ejected in 1662. Afterwards he preached here as he had opportunity. In 1672 he took out a license and preached twice every Lord's Day in a

private house. He died at Bolton Dec. 12, 1685, aged seventy-two. Mr. Park was lecturer at Bolton at the time of the ejection. He also preached here occasionally to some of his old hearers till 1669, in which year he died aged seventy. These holy men may be considered as having laid the foundation of the dissenting cause at Bolton. Mr. John Lever ejected from Cockey Moor Chapel, about three miles from Bolton, succeeded these worthy men in their labours, and collected a numerous congregation. He died July 4, 1692, aged fifty-eight. Mr. Robert Seddon, a native of Prestolee, near Bolton, who had been ejected from the rectory of Langley, in Derbyshire, became his successor. He was very laborious in his Master's work, though advanced in years when he came to this place. Having purchased a house in Bank-street, Bolton, with a considerable quantity of land behind it, he gave the people liberty, as they wanted a more convenient place of worship, to erect the present spacious chapel on it.\* He did not long enjoy his new chapel as he died of a paralytic stroke at his brother's house, in Prestolee, March, 1695, aged sixty-six, and was buried in Ringley Chapel Yard. The tenth sermon in the Collection of Country Farewell Sermons is his. O. Heywood preached at Bolton, in June, 1696, and administered the Lord's Supper to several hundred communicants. Mr. Samuel Bourn, nephew to Mr. Seddon, whom he recommended to his people on his death-bed, became his successor. Mr. Bourn continued his labours at Bolton till March 4, 1719, on which day he entered into the joy of his Lord, in the seventy-second year of his age. His religious sentiments were decidedly orthodox, as appears from a volume of his Sermons, published after his death, to which is prefixed a preface by Mr. Tong, in which he gives the following description of Mr. Bourn as a minister: "I thought him one of the best preachers I ever heard, and I doubt not but I speak the sense of those that are much better judges. He

\* The first preaching-place occupied by the Non-conformists in Bolton, was on the south side of Deansgate, at the back of the public house called the Woolpack, and the house now occupied by Mr. Yates, the Bookseller.



faithfully continued in the doctrine of the Reformed churches, not merely because it was theirs, but because upon long and intimate acquaintance with the Holy Scriptures and with his own soul, he found it to be the doctrine of the gospel, and a doctrine according to godliness. *I have heard him lament some deviations he had observed, from what he believed to be the truth as it is in Jesus.*" If Mr. Bourn was grieved at the appearance of the first deviations from orthodox sentiments among his dissenting brethren, how would his righteous soul have been distressed could he have foreseen the near approaches which some of his successors have made to the system of Infidelity! He left a legacy of 20*l.* towards the expences of the weekly lecture established in this chapel. Mr. Withington appears to have been here a very short time after Mr. Bourn. Afterwards Thomas Dixon M. D. was minister at this place, who died in 1729. He was followed by Mr. Buck, who continued to be minister here several years. Mr. Philip Holland came to Bolton, in 1754, and preached what are called Unitarian sentiments.\* During his ministry those who loved the Saviour's honour, and gloried in his cross as the only foundation of a sinner's hope, withdrew from the place and sought their religious edification elsewhere. Some of these united in the erection of the Independent Chapel in Duke's Alley. Mr. John Holland succeeded his uncle, and was ordained at this place, May 13th, 1789. He resigned his charge on account of ill health. Mr. Jones removed from Walmsley Chapel to this place, and was here a short time. The present minister is Mr. Franklin Baker, who was ordained, September 23, 1824. This place has considerable endowments. A weekly lecture was established here on Monday, the market day, by Mr. Nathaniel Hilton, of London, but a native of Bolton. Several sermons preached by Messrs. Newcome, Baldwin, Pendlebury and Walker, the first lecturers, are

\* His friend Job Orton saw and bewailed this in a letter to Mr. Hughes of Berry, in which he says: "I am sorry to find my friend Holland sink the inspiration of the Apostles, and their epistles lower than I think he can justify. I have freely written to him on the subject.

still extant in MSS., and are decidedly evangelical. The endowments in support of this Lecture are known to be of orthodox origin, and this is probably the case with some of the others.

**BOLTON**, Deansgate chapel.—This is one of the few places in this county of which the Unitarians have obtained a legal or honourable possession. It was purchased by the friends of Mr. G. Harris the present minister, when he removed from Liverpool.

**BURY**.—The Rev. H. Pendlebury, a truly orthodox and useful preacher, ejected from Holcombe Chapel near Bury, was the founder of the dissenting cause in this parish, having persevered in his labours, as the times would admit, during forty-four years. Many of the inhabitants of the town were strongly attached to his ministry, and attended his preaching till his death in 1695. In the days of his successor, Mr. E. Rothwell, that part of the congregation residing in Bury, being sufficiently numerous and wealthy, resolved to erect the present chapel in Silver-street, in the year 1719. Mr. Braddock was the first minister of this chapel, and is reputed to have been orthodox in sentiment. He was minister here forty-five years. He was followed by Mr. John Hughes from Daventry Academy to whom many of Job Orton's letters are addressed.\* He occupied the pulpit about thirty five years, and was probably an Arian. Mr. Allard the present minister has been here above twenty years. Dr. Watts's Psalms and Hymns have very lately been expelled from this place of worship, and a new selection adopted in their room. There are endowments attached to the chapel of about 80l. per annum. It is understood that the minister officiating in this place receives a portion of Lady Hewley's Funds.

**CHORLEY**.—Little is known of the early history of Non-

\* In one of these he says: "I would wish to revive something of that spirit which appeared so eminently and beautifully in your predecessors, Pendlebury, Rothwell and Braddock. I hope you will never give any of your aged hearers reason to complain, that it is not with them as in years past, but will support the high credit which the ministry at Bury hath long been in, for seriousness, zeal and usefulness."

conformity in this town. Mr. Henry Welch, who was distinguished for his unfeigned piety and ministerial faithfulness, was ejected from the parish church of Chorley. He died in 1665, aged 64. The chapel now occupied by the Unitarians is said to have been built by Abraham Crompton, Esq., of Chorley Hall, in 1725. Mr. Samuel Bourn, son of Mr. Bourn of Bolton, was the first minister at the chapel and removed from hence to Birmingham in 1732. In the latter part of his life he embraced the Arian system. After him Mr. Bent was minister here many years, but the writer is not acquainted with his religious sentiments. Mr. Tate is the present minister, who was formerly a preacher amongst the Wesleyan Methodists. The chapel is endowed.

CHOWBENT.—Mr. James Woods ejected from the episcopal chapel in this place continued to exercise his ministry among his former hearers, according as circumstances permitted, in public and private. He was the means of raising a large and respectable congregation of dissenters here, over whom he presided many years. He was esteemed an indefatigable and useful minister. He died about the year 1669. His son succeeded him in the pastoral office till his death in February 1759, having been minister here sixty years. He is said to have been a faithful servant of Christ. The father and son preached at this place above a century. Mr. Matthew Henry, who was much esteemed here by those who occasionally enjoyed the benefit of his labours, came from Chester to visit his old friends at Chowbent about a fortnight before his death in June 1714. It is recorded of the younger of these Woods, that when intelligence was brought to Chowbent of the approach of the Scotch Rebels in 1715, he headed his congregation armed with scythes and other implements of husbandry, and marched with them to Walton, near Preston to dispute with them the passage of the Ribble, but the king's forces arriving in time, and the subsequent capitulation of the Scots rendered *General Wood's* intended assistance unnecessary. The present chapel at Chowbent was erected in 1722. It is a large handsome building and is amply endowed. Mr. Davies has been minister here

many years. The congregation is so small that in this large chapel, only fifteen persons have sometimes been present during service in the winter of 1824.

**COCKEY-MOOR.**—The Bartholemew Act in 1662, found Mr. John Lever at this place. The congregation appears to have continued worshipping in the episcopal chapel here many years afterwards, notwithstanding the Act of Uniformity. They obtained the assistance of their former pastor and other ejected ministers as they could. Mr. John Crompton, who died in August 1703, is called minister of Cockey Chapel by Mr. Matthew Henry, who notices his death and speaks of him as a man of the first rank, both for ministerial gifts and graces, stedfast to his principles in trying times, and an ornament to his holy profession. The Chapel now occupied by the Unitarians was erected in 1718. The trust deed specially states that “the ministers of the said congregation who for the time being shall officiate there must be sound in the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, and such as hold and profess the *Doctrinal Articles of the Church of England*, required to be subscribed by the pastor or teacher of such congregation.” Mr. Whitworth was minister at the time the new chapel was built, many notes of his sermons taken at the time of delivery are yet extant, and prove that the doctrinal sentiments he preached corresponded with those of the Church of England, to which he was required to subscribe. He died February 13th, 1721, in the sixty-sixth year of age, after having been minister at Cockey Chapel twenty-five years. He was buried in the chapel where his gravestone may yet be seen.\* He was succeeded by Mr. Peter Seddon who had been settled at Penrith, in Cumberland, and died April 26th, 1731, in the forty third year of his age. He lies buried in the yard of Cockey Dissenting Chapel.† Mr. Dobson followed him,

\* The writer has seen some notes of Sermons preached at Cockey Chapel in the years 1724 and 1726, which are decidedly evangelical, by a Mr. Dixon, but does not know that he was the stated minister of the place at the time.

† There is a MS. sermon of Mr. P. Seddon’s still in a state of preservation preached by him at Cockey about a month before his death, which contains satisfactory evidence of his orthodoxy.

and continued parson of this people thirty-six years. He died August 29th, 1767, aged 75. Then came Mr. Barnes, whose popularity was so great that it was found necessary considerably to enlarge the chapel, which was well filled during his ministry. On his removal to Manchester in 1780, Mr. Joseph Bealey became the minister. He removed to Warrington, when Mr. King officiated at this place; but when Mr. Bealey had been at Warrington about two years, he returned to Cockeys-moor, and remained here till his death in 1813. In the latter part of his life he acknowledged himself to be a decided Unitarian, but still continued to retain possession of the pulpit. Before his death the congregation very much declined, many of his former hearers disapproving of his new sentiments sought their spiritual instruction elsewhere. Mr. Brettell educated at York Academy was minister here a short time, and then removed to Rotherham. Mr. Whitehead is the present minister and preaches to a small congregation. The amount of the endowments received by the Trustees is about 120*l.* *per annum.*

**DOB-LANE**, near Manchester.—This place is sometimes called Newton-heath. The chapel owes its origin, it is believed, to the evangelical labours of Mr. William Walker, who was ejected from an Episcopal place of worship in this neighbourhood. He afterwards preached at Rivington, and was one of the Bolton Lecturers. Some notes of his sermons are still preserved, and the orthodox truths they contain are a perfect contrast to the doctrines taught in a number of sermons the writer has seen, which were preached here by Mr. Robinson, between the years 1755 and 1775. Mr. Lewis Loyd, now an eminent banker in Manchester and London, was formerly minister at this place.

**GATEACRE**, near Liverpool.—This chapel was built by the friends of orthodoxy and is very liberally endowed. Little information has been obtained concerning the earliest ministers at this place. When Mr. Joseph Lawton came to Gateacre he preached evangelical doctrines, and was very

diligent in catechizing the young, and visiting the sick. At one period, he was suspected of Arianism, and some of the congregation left the ministry to attend Toxteth Park chapel, where the gospel was then preached. He is said to have disavowed his Arian sentiments towards the close of life, and a fragment of the last sermon he preached in the chapel, January 31st, 1747, on 2 Cor. v. 17, is orthodox. He left some land to the chapel which lets for 40*l.* *per annum*. Beside this, there are other endowments to a considerable amount. His successors were Messrs. Richard Godwin and Edwards. The present minister is Mr. Shepherd, who publicly advocated Mr. Brougham's education bill. His congregation is very small, about twenty.

**GORTON**, near Manchester. Mr. William Leigh, an intimate acquaintance and friend of his neighbours Angier and Newcome, was ejected from the old chapel at Gorton. He was a man of good abilities, and very laborious in the work of the ministry. He died in 1664, about fifty years of age. The persons who built the original dissenting chapel at Gorton, were those who acknowledged and loved the evangelical truths contained in the Doctrinal Articles of the Church of England and the Assembly's Catechism. The endowments are about 200*l.* a year, and the person who left the principal estate is known to have been of orthodox sentiments. Mr. Atchison was minister here about forty years, when he removed to Leicester. Mr. W. D. Cooper removed from Stand to Gorton in the year 1788, and died at this place in 1801. He was succeeded by Mr. Ramsbottom, who died a short time after he came to Gorton. Mr. Jeffreys is the present Minister.

**HINDLEY**, near Wigan. Mr. James Bradshaw, born in the parish of Bolton, was ejected from Hindley Episcopal Chapel in 1662. Afterwards he removed to Rainford, and died in 1702, in the 67th year of his age. In the latter part of his life he was one of the Lecturers at Bolton, and probably preached to the survivors of his old flock at Hindley. The chapel, now occupied by the Unitarians here, was built by Mr. Crook, of Abram, in the year 1700. He

left two fields to it, which, with other endowments, amount to about 100*l. per annum*. He is said to have been of orthodox sentiments. This is one of the places Mr. Matthew Henry usually preached at in his visits to Lancashire. Mr. Thomas Whalley was minister at this place, and died here in 1706. Mr. James Brownlow occupied this pulpit in 1715. Later ministers at this place, some of whom were Unitarians, are Messrs. Bourn, Davenport, Hodgkinson, who preached here upwards of thirty years, Manley, Kay, and Ragland, the present minister.

**KNOWSLEY**, near Prescott. This chapel is not far from Knowsley Park, the residence of the Earl of Derby, and as the Countess of Derby, who presented the vicarage of Ormskirk to Mr. Nathaniel Heywood, held him in high esteem, it is highly probable that this place of worship was built by some of that noble family who had been benefited by his ministry. Certain it is, that the chapel is of orthodox origin, as the trust deed states, that the minister officiating there shall preach according to the *doctrinal Articles of the Church of England*, and shall teach the *Assembly's Catechism*. It is endowed with an estate in Cheshire. The chapel here has undergone various changes of late years. No minister being settled here, the Rev. John Yates, of Liverpool, who has the management of the place, permitted the Wesleyan Methodists to occupy the pulpit; but at present two laymen, members of the Established Church, go from Liverpool on the Lord's day, one to read prayers, and the other to read a sermon. Hence it appears, that though Knowsley Chapel may be under the control of Unitarians, it is not literally occupied by them.

**LANCASTER**. Doctor William Marshall was ejected from this vicarage in 1662. The present chapel in Nicholas-street, was built for Mr. Day who is supposed to have been an Arian and settled here in 1740. The former chapel was built by persons of orthodox sentiments. An orthodox minister, of the name of Grimshaw, was once settled here. The descendants of some of those who left the place when Unitarianism was introduced, are yet living in Lancaster. The persons now holding possession of the

chapel say, that the trust deed cannot be found. The endowment is about 100*l. per annum* arising from two estates in the neighbourhood, and part, if not the whole, was given when the people were orthodox. The congregation seldom amounts to twenty persons. Mr. W. Lamport is the minister here.

**LIVERPOOL, Renshaw-Street.** The dissenting interest at Liverpool, was commenced by a number of persons who had been accustomed to attend at Toxteth Park Chapel, in an adjoining township. Mr. Christopher Richardson ejected from Kirk-Heaton, Yorkshire, a man eminent for his acquaintance with the scriptures and his ministerial usefulness, preached alternately at Toxteth Park and Liverpool. In 1688, the persons attending his ministry, who resided in the town, built a chapel in Castle Hey, now called Harrington-street. Mr. Richardson continued his pious labours in this place till his death, 1698, when about eighty years of age. Owing to the increase of the town of Liverpool, and the consequent enlargement of the congregation, the people built a much larger place of worship in Benn's Gardens, to which they removed in 1727. This chapel was sold to the Welch Wesleyan Methodists a few years since, though it is said the trustees acknowledged they could not give the purchaser a legal title, but gave him a bond of indemnity that he should not be disturbed in his possession. With the sum of 2000*l.*, for which the old chapel was sold, and other means, the congregation formerly assembling in Benn's Gardens built the present Unitarian Chapel in Renshaw-street, in 1811. The endowments left to the chapel in Benn's Gardens are understood to have been taken with the congregation to their new place of worship. The following is a list of most of the ministers of this congregation. First a Mr. Angier. Then Dr. Winder. After him was a Mr. Anderson who conformed and preached at St. Paul's in this town. He was a popular preacher. Dr. Enfield preached to this people some years, and was succeeded by Dr. Clayton, who left Benn's Gardens, and took with him a large part of the congregation, who built for him a place called the Octagon. He was assisted by Mr. Kilpatrick, but the congre-



gation dwindled to nothing and the chapel has been pulled down. Mr. Lewin came to Benn's Gardens after the removal of Dr. Clayton. He was minister at the time the people removed to Renshaw-street. Mr. Harris now of Bolton was minister here a few years.

LIVERPOOL, Paradise street. This elegant chapel was erected in 1791, partly, if not principally, by the proceeds of a former place of worship built by Trinitarians. The congregation had its origin about the year 1707, and worshipped in a chapel in Key-street till their removal to this place. Mr. Basnett was one of the first ministers at Key-street chapel and was of evangelical sentiments.\* Mr. Breckell appears to have succeeded him. He published a volume of sermons addressed to seamen. A Mr. Taylor was minister here, who removed to Dublin. Mr. Yates was the pastor of the people when they removed to Paradise-street, and is now succeeded by Mr. Grundy from Manchester.

MANCHESTER.—CROSS STREET CHAPEL.—The original place of worship built on this spot was erected in 1693 for the congregation of Dissenters collected by Mr. Henry Newcome, who was ejected from the Collegiate church of this town. This chapel was nearly destroyed by a mob in 1714, and parliament gave 1500*l.* to repair it. In 1737 it was enlarged and rebuilt; and in 1788 during the popular ministry of Dr. Barnes it was again enlarged. Mr. Newcome, who was a man of very superior abilities, came to Manchester in 1656, and preached with much success in the parish church till his ejection. When prevented from exercising his ministry in public he embraced every opportunity of promoting the personal edification of his flock by his private labours. He was accounted by his people and brethren in the ministry as a star of the first magnitude, and was justly called “a prince of preachers.” His various publications prove that his religious sentiments corresponded with those still professed by evangelical dissen-

\* The writer has manuscript notes of a Sermon preached by Mr. Basnett, in 1725, on *Psa.* xxiv. 7. which are decidedly orthodox.

ters. He died deeply lamented by the church of Christ, Sept. 17, 1695.\* Mr. Tong when noticing his death in the life of Matthew Henry says: "Before that year was finished Lancashire lost one of the greatest blessings that ever the providence of God favoured it with in the last age. When I say this, every body will conclude I mean that reverend, holy, and evangelical minister, Mr. Henry Newcome."† In the latter part of his life he was assisted in his work both as a pastor and an instructor of youth by

Mr. John Chorlton. He was a fit coadjutor and successor of such a man as Mr. Newcome. He died, when just entering the prime of life and when engaged in a sphere of very extensive usefulness, May 19, 1705. Mr. Matthew Henry speaks of his death with more than common concern, and says of him, "He was eminent for solid judgment, great thought, an extraordinary quickness and readiness of expression, a casuist one of a thousand, a wonderful clear head, and one that did '*dominari in concionibus*, and of great sincerity and serious piety. He was in the fortieth year of his age, and was my beloved friend and correspondent about sixteen years. O Lord, wilt thou make a full end!" Mr. Chorlton's sermons, some of which are preserved in manuscript, are like his worthy predecessor's truly evangelical. The following are a few extracts from one of them preached only a few months before his death on Rev. i. 17. "Fear not; I am the first and the last." "These words set forth the unchangeableness of Jesus Christ. In him there is no change; he is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. His merit and righteousness, his Spirit and grace are the same. Whatever he was, that he is, and ever will be both to the church and every true believer. These words inform us that Jesus Christ is the supreme God, and therefore worthy of all love and fear and service. Isa. xlv. 6. "Thus saith the Lord, the King of Israel, and his Redeemer the Lord of Hosts; I am the

\* Mr. Newcome was buried at Cross-street chapel, but the stone which recorded his death, &c. has been removed.

† See also Memoir of Mr. Newcome in Select Noncon. Remains.

first, and I am the last ; and beside me there is no God." The great Jehovah distinguisheth himself from all pretended deities ; and so it is clear that he is the true and supreme God. Here also is comfort against the fear of death. Jesus Christ was dead and is alive again, and lives for evermore ; and if he be the first and the last, then those that are his have no reason to be afraid of dying, for he will take care of the time, and manner, and circumstances, of their change, and of their inward frame. He by dying has taken the sting out of death for all that are his. These words shew, what addresses and applications are made to Jesus Christ. Those with whom he is first and last will come to him and plead with him. Many a prayer will they put up to him, and many a meditation will they have of him. They will go to him with their wants and necessities, for strength against sin, and for wisdom how to carry themselves in all conditions. Christ's throne of grace is not unfrequented but by those who are strangers to the riches that are in him." These are the scriptural doctrines this man of God preached to his people, and which were the comfort of his soul in the approach of death. What a contrast do they form to those that have been since promulgated from the same pulpit !

Mr. James Coningham was educated in the University of Edinburgh. He was first settled at Penrith in Cumberland, where he was very useful in the conversion of souls and the establishment of a seminary for training up young men in academical studies. Sometime after the death of Mr. Newcome he was invited to become co-pastor and assistant in the work of tuition with Mr. Chorlton, which invitation he accepted in 1700. During Mr. Chorlton's life he was very happy in his station, but afterwards meeting with many difficulties he removed to London, in 1712, and became pastor of the church assembling at Haberdasher's Hall, where he continued till his death in 1716, in the forty-seventh year of his age.

Mr. Joseph Mottershead was educated at Attercliffe near Sheffield, under the pious instruction of Timothy Jollie. He was ordained when only twenty years of age, and settled at

Nantwich in Cheshire. It was in his meeting-place Mr. Matthew Henry preached his last sermon, and from his house the day after his holy soul took its flight to the world of spirits, June 22, 1714. When Mr. Mottershead came to Manchester about the year 1717, it is acknowledged that he found the congregation at Cross-street "rigid Calvinists," and was supposed to be decidedly orthodox himself. In the latter part of his ministry it is probable he imbibed Arian principles. He is said to have been a convert for a time to the Socinian arguments of his son-in-law, Mr. Seddon, but that "afterwards he reverted to his former opinions." He died Nov. 4, 1771, at the advanced age of eighty-three, having been minister at Cross-street Chapel about fifty-four years. He is buried in the middle aisle of the chapel just before the pulpit. Mr. John Seddon became assistant to Mr. Mottershead in the year 1739, whose daughter he afterwards married. He was born in Little Lever about the year 1717 and received the first part of his education at Stand school. Afterwards he was admitted a pupil of Dr. Rotheram's at Kendal, and then removed to the University of Glasgow, where he took the degree of M. A. He was one of the first who preached Socinian doctrines in the pulpits of Lancashire. In one of his published sermons he says: "thoroughly persuaded I am, and therefore I think myself in duty bound openly and publicly to declare my own conviction, that the New Testament, rightly understood, does not afford any real foundation for either an Athanasian, Arian, or *any* notion of a Trinity at all." However we may admire the intrepidity of Mr. Seddon, for the public avowal of what he believed to be truth, we cannot applaud his integrity, for continuing to preach in a chapel and partaking of emoluments designed for the support of those very doctrines he impugned. Thus by the Arian preaching of Mr. Mottershead and the Socinian declamations of Mr. Seddon, the friends of evangelical truth to the amount of about 200 were driven to other places, and the effects produced on the souls of those who remained and their descendants is a subject eter-

nity alone can fully disclose. Mr. Seddon died Nov. 22, 1769, when about fifty-four years of age. He lies buried in the vestry of the chapel. Mr. Gore appears to have been chosen as the successor of Mr. Seddon, though his sentiments concerning the person of Christ were not exactly the same, he being an Arian. He died in 1779, and was buried in the chapel. Mr. R. Harrison became minister at Cross-street in the room of Mr. Mottershead. His religious opinions accorded with Mr. Seddon's rather than Mr. Mottershead's. He edited a small volume of Mr. Seddon's Sermons on the "Person of Christ, &c." with a Memoir of the author, in which he speaks of him in terms of high commendation. Mr. Harrison died Nov. 24, 1810, having been a preacher at this place thirty-eight years.

Dr. Thomas Barnes was chosen to succeed Mr. Gore. He was born at Warrington, Feb. 1, 1747. After he had finished his academical education he settled at Cockey Moor Chapel, near Bolton; but receiving an invitation to Cross-street, after the death of Mr. Gore, he accepted it, and entered on his labours at Manchester, in 1780. His popular manners gratified a numerous congregation that attended his ministry. He took an active part in many of the charitable and literary institutions of the town; and when on the dissolution of the Academy at Warrington, one on a similar plan was commenced at Manchester, he undertook the office of Divinity Tutor. But "he was disappointed, grieved, and humbled; and after about twelve years of unremitting and generous industry he resigned his office." What were his sentiments concerning the distinguishing doctrines of the gospel is not easily ascertained, but probably they were Arian. The author of his funeral sermon says: "A fear of hurting the feelings, by counteracting the religious prejudices of part of his congregation, induced him cautiously to avoid the discussion and illustration of some of the unpopular doctrines of the gospel." If Dr. Barnes was prevented by the fear of man from declaring the whole counsel of God, he ill-discharged the awfully responsible duties

of his office as a minister of the gospel. He died June, 27, 1810, having preached at this place thirty years.

Mr. John Grundy became the successor of Dr. Barnes. Soon after his settlement at Cross-street he delivered a course of Lectures in which he stated "the peculiar doctrines of Unitarian belief." These lectures excited great attention at Manchester and the neighbourhood at the time of delivery, and were afterwards published. Mr. Grundy removed from Manchester to Liverpool in August last, on which occasion a dinner was given by some of the Cross-street congregation for the purpose of publicly presenting to him a "handsome silver tea service, as a testimony of their high regard for the zeal he has evinced in the cause of Unitarian Christianity." The speeches delivered after this dinner, which were published in the Manchester Gazette, gave rise to the controversy detailed in this publication. Mr. J. G. Robberds who had been educated at York College, and is a Unitarian, was appointed Mr. Grundy's coadjutor at Cross-street on the death of Mr. Harrison, and continues to occupy the pulpit. Mr. I. H. Worthington, a student of Manchester College, York, has been elected amidst considerable dissatisfaction, to succeed Mr. Grundy, but has not entered on his stated ministerial duties, not having completed his studies. Lady Hewley's Trustees have partly supplied him with a Socinian education.

**MOSLEY-STREET, Manchester.**—This is one of the few places occupied by the Unitarians built for the purpose of maintaining what is denominated Unitarian worship. A Liturgy accommodated to the doctrines of Unitarianism is used in this place in the forenoon. Mr. Hawkes who died a few years since was the first minister of this chapel. He is succeeded by Mr. Taylor from York Academy.

**MONTON, near Eccles.**—*Originally Orthodox.*—Mr. Edmund Jones was ejected from Eccles, whose father had been many years Vicar of that parish. After his ejection he preached about twelve years in private or public, as the ruling powers permitted, till his death in 1674. Sometime after his decease, Mr. Roger Baldwin, ejected from Rainford in this

County, removed in to this neighbourhood and preached with much acceptance and usefulness, and collected a numerous and respectable congregation. "He was a solid, scriptural, judicious preacher." Some notes of his sermons preached at the Bolton lecture are still preserved, and contain such an exhibition of gospel truth as would be acceptable in the orthodox pulpits of the present day. He died June 9, 1695, aged seventy. It is probable that the old chapel at Monton was built in the latter part of Mr. Baldwin's ministry: the present place of worship is built on the site of the old one. After Mr. Baldwin's death, Mr. Thomas Crompton ejected from Toxteth Park Chapel, near Liverpool, removed to this place. He died September 2, 1699, aged sixty-four. He was succeeded by Mr. Jeremiah Aldred, whose memory is still revered by some of the old families in the neighbourhood. He was a faithful pastor and scriptural preacher, and during his ministry the chapel was often crowded with attentive hearers many of whom came from a considerable distance. Mr. Aldred was an intimate friend of Matthew Henry, and was earnestly invited by the people at Chester to become their minister when his friend removed to Hackney; in this request Mr. Henry united, but after much serious deliberation and prayer the application was negatived. He died in 1729. After his death Mr. Chorley became minister at Monton. He is supposed to have imbibed the Arian scheme. Mr. Fenner followed Mr. Chorley, and afterwards removed from this place about the year 1779. Mr. R. Smithurst is the present minister. The endowments are about 80*l. per annum*, and the congregation is small.

OLDHAM.—The Unitarian chapel in this place was built a few years since, by the subscriptions of those who approve of the system of doctrines denominated Unitarianism. It is one of the few places of worship to which they have a legitimate claim. No minister has been settled here, but occasional supplies come to preach to a very small number of people. The preacher and the whole of his congregation have been seen conducting their worship all in one pew.

ORMSKIRK.—*Originally Orthodox*.—The eminently pious

and laborious Mr. Nathaniel Heywood, was ejected from the Vicarage\* of this parish in 1662. He continued preaching in the church sometime after the passing of the Act of Uniformity, till a successor was appointed. His labours in the parish were very successful to the good of souls. In 1672 he licensed two preaching-places, one at Bickerstaff about two miles south-east of Ormskirk, and another at Scarisbrick, about four miles north-west of Ormskirk, and preached at them alternately. He was taken away in the midst of his usefulness and in the prime of his life, December 6, 1677, in the forty-fourth year of his age. His Sermons entitled "Christ the Best Gift and Best Master," published after his death, show the exalted opinion he entertained of the person and benefits of Christ. His death was universally lamented even by some who had formerly been his opponents and persecutors. His brother Oliver Heywood deeply bewailed his death in the following language extracted from one of his MSS. "This is a great loss to the church and nation, to that parish, to his family, and to me in particular. O lamentable loss! What shall I say? How are the mighty fallen! How is the beauty of Israel slain upon the high places! Alas! alas! those pleasant gardens of Eden which have been watered with the rivers of God *are likely to be as the mountains of Gilboa, upon which no more wholesome doctrines will drop and distil as the dew.* O my dear and lovely brother! what words shall I take to lament thee with? Alas my brother! the honour of our family is gone! He was a christian and a minister of great parts, an ornament to his generation, eminent for zeal, piety, humility, and all ministerial endowments, &c." It is believed Mr. O. Heywood wrote the interesting account of Nathaniel Heywood's Life, published in 1695, with a dedication by Sir Henry Ashurst to Lord Willoughby. (This Memoir will be republished with the Life and Works of O. Heywood now

\* The original presentation of Mr. Heywood to the Vicarage of Ormskirk in 1657, signed by the Countess of Derby, is still in the possession of one of his descendants. He is the ancestor of the respectable families of Heywoods in Manchester, Liverpool, Wakefield and London.



in the Press.) The people to whom Mr. Nathaniel Heywood had broken the bread of life, embraced the earliest opportunity of erecting a place of worship in the town of Ormskirk, and gave his son Nathaniel Heywood jun., who had been a pupil of Mr. Frankland's, an invitation to be their minister which he accepted, and laboured amongst them till his death, October 26, 1704. He was much subject to lowness of spirits, but when thus afflicted would often preach in a lively manner without the use of notes. He was succeeded at Ormskirk by Mr. Hugh Worthington, who received his education partly from Mr. Timothy Jollie, and partly from the celebrated Mr. Matthew Henry. In 1707 he removed to Dean Row, in Cheshire, and died there about 1737. Mr. Alexander Wright was minister here in 1715. The chapel is endowed, and, it is said, there are now about a dozen hearers.

**PADIHAM**, near Burnley. A chapel has been built here for the use of a congregation raised by the preaching of the Unitarian Methodists. It was opened for public worship in Whitsun-week 1823.

**PARK-LANE**, near Wigan. This place was built by the friends of Orthodoxy. Mr. Thomas Blinstone,\* a man of evangelical sentiments and one of Mr. Frankland's students, was here at the commencement of the last century. Mr. John Brownlow afterwards preached here near fifty-years, and is reputed to have been an orthodox preacher. Mr. Thomas Smith, who had been preacher amongst the Wesleyan Methodists, removed from Stand to this place about the year 1811. The endowments on this chapel are about 100*l.* a year. One of the tenants refuses to pay his rent, assigning as his reason that the estate was not left for the benefit of Unitarian but Trinitarian Dissenters. Mr. Kirkpatrick was minister here above forty years since, and was succeeded by Mr. Broadbent who died here. Both these were of Unitarian sentiments.

**PLATT**, near Manchester. The present chapel is built on the site of an old one which was erected about the year 1700

\* He was the maternal grandfather of the late Dr. Barnes of Manchester.

for Mr. Finch, an eminent orthodox divine, who had been ejected from Walton, and was afterwards turned out of Birch, a domestic chapel near this place. Mr. Finch died November 13, 1704. The old trust deed says, that the doctrines preached here shall be according to the *Assembly's Catechism, and the Doctrinal Articles of the Church of England*. Mr. John Whitaker succeeded Mr. Finch in the ministry at this chapel. Like his predecessor, he is known to have been of evangelical principles, and preached according to the doctrinal articles of the church of England. During the pious labours of these christian teachers the congregation was numerous, at present it often does not exceed twenty persons. The ministers who have preached here since Mr. Whitaker's death are Messrs. Haughton, Meanley, Checkley, and Whitelegg the present minister, most or all of whom have professed Unitarianism.

**PRESCOT.**—This chapel is not of so early a date as some in this county but is of orthodox origin. Part of the endowment at this place is connected with that of Knowsley. The present minister is Mr. W. T. Proctor. Mr. Nathaniel Heywood frequently preached in a private house at Prescott after his ejection.

**PRESTON.**—The present chapel was built about the year 1718, but it is probable there was a preaching place in this town prior to the chapel now standing. Mr. John Turner was minister at Walton and Preston in 1714. He was succeeded by Mr. Pilkington who continued to preach at both chapels. The endowment is about 60*l.* per annum, and arises partly from the rents of Walton chapel which is now converted into dwelling houses. Mr. W. M. Walker was for a short time minister at the chapel in Preston, but on account of his preaching Trinitarian doctrines was required to resign his office. This he did, and his friends who constituted the majority of his former hearers, built for him the Independent Chapel in Grimshaw Street. The Unitarian minister at Preston is partly supported by the bounty of Lady Hewley's Trustees, partly by the rents of Walton chapel let as cottages, and partly by a congregation of about forty persons.

RAWTONSTALL, in Rossendale—The Trust Deed of this chapel bears date May 17, 1760. It states that the Meeting-house erected there is put in trust for the use of “Protestant Dissenters, distinguished by the name of Independents, so long as there are and shall be a minister to preach in it, and a congregation to meet in it that can and shall *subscribe unto a book of Articles* made, owned, confessed and subscribed unto by the present congregation and members of this church, intitled “An Answer to every one that asketh a reason of the hope that is in us.” The first minister of this chapel was a Mr. Richard Whittaker, who preached here about twenty years. The minister now occupying the place is Mr. John Ingham, who has been here above forty years. When he came hither he professed to be of orthodox sentiments, but about seven years since he acknowledged himself to be what is known by the term Unitarian. He has in his possession the book of Articles mentioned in the trust deed and required to be signed by the minister and members of the church, and confesses he does not believe the doctrinal sentiments therein contained, though he continues to hold possession of the pulpit. Since he has embraced and preached Unitarian doctrines he has received support from Lady Hewley’s Funds.

RISLEY, near Warrington.—This chapel was built for Mr. Thomas Risley, who was born in this neighbourhood, August 27, 1630. When ejected from the University of Oxford by the Act of Uniformity, he retired to his family estate and preached to his neighbours in private. After the revolution, they were formed into a regular society, to which he publicly administered the ordinances of the gospel. His religious sentiments were evidently orthodox. He published a treatise on the “Evil of Neglecting Family Prayer,” to which Mr. John Howe wrote a preface. He died in 1715, in the eighty-sixth year of his age. His son John Risley was assistant and successor to his father. In the year 1717, a sum of money was given towards the support of a gospel ministry in this place. A person, who was at that time appointed one of the Trustees, notices the circumstance in his

diary and adds, "Lord I would act therein as one that hath found mercy of the Lord to be faithful." If this scriptural spirit had influenced every succession of Trustees of orthodox endowments, there would be no cause to complain of the present gross perversion of trust property amongst dissenters. The Endowment is 70*l. per annum*.

**RIVINGTON.**—Mr. Samuel Newton was the person ejected from the episcopal chapel here; but consenting to read some of the prayers, was permitted to preach after Bartholomew day. Mr. Walker ejected from Newton Heath Chapel, succeeded him in ministering the gospel to this people. He is supposed to have been the first minister of the dissenting chapel at Rivington. He was one of the lecturers at Bolton, and some of his sermons preached at this lecture prove his orthodoxy. When the Conventicle Act was in force, the good people at Rivington frequently assembled to worship God according to the dictates of their consciences in the open air, at a place called Winter-hill. Seats were cut out of the side of the hill, still visible, so as to form an amphitheatre, in the centre of which was a stone pulpit. Between eighty and ninety years ago, when Arian sentiments were introduced into this place, two of the pious people were so distressed that they agreed to call a child of theirs, born at this time, Ichabod, because they considered the glory was departed. The endowments belonging to Rivington chapel arise chiefly from the rents of cottages built several years since, with money that had been out at interest, the whole or part of which was left at the time Trinitarian doctrines were preached in the place. It is understood that the original Trust Deed requires that the *Assembly's Catechism* shall be taught here. Some persons now living, knew others who in their youth had been publicly taught it in the chapel.

**ROCHDALE.**—*Blackwater Street Chapel.* Mr. Robert Bath, Vicar of this parish, united with the second classis of ministers who met at Bury, for the purpose of ordaining preachers and managing the ecclesiastical affairs of this district. He was very diligent in his work as a servant of Christ, and was much beloved by his people. When ejected

from the church he continued to preach in a private house to crowded audiences of his old hearers till 1674. After his death the people were occasionally visited by Mr. Pendlebury and various nonconformist ministers. Mr. Oliver Heywood often preached in this town on his way to and from Yorkshire and Lancashire. Mr. Joseph Dawson was minister here in 1706, and died minister of this people in 1739. The present chapel was built during his ministry, so that there must have been a place of worship prior to this building. The Trust Deed is dated 1716. The founders of this edifice were many of them persons in humble life and contributed manually as well as with their money towards the present building. It is a very plain structure, and was originally more so than at this time, for about thirty years since it underwent a thorough repair at a considerable expence. Mr. Richard Scholfield was minister here a short time. He died in 1740. Mr. Owen was his successor, who was a man possessing the talent of wit and sarcasm to a very great degree, by which he defended himself and his fellow dissenters from the attacks of the high church party of those days. His religious sentiments corresponded with the doctrines of Arius. — Hopkins, M. D. was probably the immediate successor of Mr. Owen, as his death is recorded in the chapel as having taken place in 1754. Mr. Hassall was minister at this place a few years and was followed in 1779 by Mr. Thomas Threlkeld, who was distinguished for the strength of his memory and his acquaintance with the learned languages. He died here in 1806. Mr. Marshall, and Mr. Richard Astley now at Halifax, were here a few years. The present minister Mr. G. W. Elliott came to Rochdale in 1815. Soon after the erection of this chapel several cottages were left by certain pious individuals, the rents of which were directed to be applied to the preaching of certain lectures at stated periods, but the attendance on these lectures having fallen off very much, the funds are appropriated to the support of the regular minister of the place. The proceeds of these cottages are about 43*l. per annum*. The other endowments belonging to the chapel amount to

55*l.* a year. The *poor* minister of this chapel is still further relieved by the trustees of Lady Hewley's property to the amount of 10*l.* or 12*l.* annually. About fifty years since if a family coming to reside at Rochdale wished to attend at Blackwater Street Chapel, they often had to wait a considerable time before they could obtain a pew; but now the congregation in winter is frequently under twenty individuals.

ROCHDALE.—*Unitarian Methodist Chapel.* This place was built in 1818, and is supplied chiefly by local preachers. One of them of the name of *Taylor* who resides in Rochdale receives a part of Lady Hewley's funds towards his support. If it be a bye law amongst the Trustees of this property, as has often been asserted, that no minister shall receive aid from this Fund who has not been educated for the ministry, then it appears, that in this case at least, their zeal for the propagation of Unitarianism by the misapplication of her bequests, has caused them to violate their own rules.

SALFORD.—A Unitarian place of worship was opened here Dec. 25, 1824. The congregation has been raised chiefly by the services of local preachers. Mr. *Beard* from Manchester College, York, has become the minister at this chapel.

STAND, near Manchester.—*Originally Orthodox.*—The founders of the Dissenting cause at this place were mostly, it is supposed, the old hearers of Mr. *Pyke*, who was ejected in 1662 from Radcliffe Church in this neighbourhood. Many of the non-conformist ministers, who resorted to Manchester as a place of refuge, it not being a corporation town, supplied the neighbouring villages as they had opportunity, and Stand enjoyed that privilege among the rest. Tradition affirms that the first preaching-place here was a barn in Higher Lane. The congregation thus collected chose Mr. *Robert Eaton* for their first minister, and built a more convenient place of worship in 1695.\* He was born in Cheshire, and finished

\* The chapel was re-built on the site of the old one in 1818.

his education at Cambridge. His first settlement was in Essex, and afterwards at Walton near Preston, whence he was ejected. He became chaplain to Lord Delamere. Mr. Eaton "was a solid divine, a good scholar, and a judicious Christian." Some sermons of his in MS. on Phil. iii. 8. 9. are truly excellent, and contain much evangelical sentiment admirably expressed. His death took place at Manchester in August 1701. His funeral sermon was preached by Mr. Finch who had been his fellow labourer at Walton. His successor was Mr. *Samuel Eaton* who died Sept. 5, 1710. Mr. Matthew Henry thus notices his death: "In him the church of God has lost a person of great learning and integrity. He was much superior to most of his brethren both for learning and estate, but the most humble, condescending and affectionate friend that I have ever known. He had buried, not long before he died, two sons and his good son-in-law Mr. Cheyney of Warrington. He was about fifty-four years of age. His memory is and will be precious." Mr. *Joseph Heywood* followed him who was at Stand in 1715. There are notes of sermons preached by him in 1727, which are truly Orthodox, but at what time he died cannot be exactly ascertained. Mr. *William Harrison* came to Stand in 1730 and removed to Buxton in 1737. Mr. *William Bond* appears to have been the next minister, and preached here about forty years. Mr. *W. D. Cooper* became minister at this place early in the year 1781, and removed to Gorton in 1788. Mr. *Awbrey* succeeded him, who, preaching Socinian doctrines, caused many of the people to withdraw and build the Independent Chapel in Stand Lane in 1792. He removed to Gloucester in 1795. He was succeeded by Mr. *Thomas Smith* who removed to Park Lane in the year 1811. The present minister is Mr. *Arthur Dean* from Manchester College, York. The chapel is endowed, but part of the endowments are not of Orthodox origin. The ministers at this chapel have for many years past received aid from Lady Hewley's property. There is also an endowed school in the chapel yard of which Mr. Dean is the master.

**TODMORDEN.**—A chapel was opened here in Whitsun-week 1824, in connexion with the Unitarian Methodists, and is principally supplied by the same lay preachers as Rochdale.

**TOXTETH PARK**, near Liverpool.—This place may boast of as great antiquity for dissent from Episcopacy as any in Lancashire. Some of the early provincial meetings of the Presbyterians are said to have been held here. Mr. *Thomas Crompton* M.A. of the University of Oxford was ejected from this chapel. He together with Mr. *Briscoe*, ejected from Walmsley chapel, continued preaching in the Episcopal chapel some time after the Act of Uniformity. They were both considered Orthodox and excellent preachers. About 1672, Mr. *Richardson* formerly of Kirk-Heaton preached at Toxteth Park and Liverpool alternately. The first Dissenting congregation at Liverpool was a branch from this place. The ministers preceding Mr. *Anderson*, who now occupies the pulpit of the Dissenting chapel here, and who has been nearly fifty years at this place, have all been reputed as Orthodox. When he came it was on the supposition that he was of the same evangelical sentiments as his predecessors. Soon after Mr. Anderson's settlement at Toxteth Park a great part of the congregation withdrew, and assisted in building the Independent chapel in Renshaw Street, Liverpool in 1777. The chapel at Toxteth Park has endowments belonging to it, some of which are expressly directed to be paid to a minister "holding and teaching sentiments conformable to the *Doctrinal Articles of the Church of England*." A correspondent says: "The congregation is literally gone to nothing, consisting often entirely of official persons, viz. the door-keeper, the gravedigger, the singers and the preacher. I have been there when there were only a dozen persons present." When Mr. Gellibrand was minister here, about a century since, the place was crowded to excess, and it was accounted a privilege to obtain standing room. He was succeeded by Mr. Kenyon, and afterwards by Mr. Harding.

**TUNLEY.**—See Wigan.



WALMSLEY, near Bolton.—Mr. Michael Briscoe of Trinity College, Dublin, was ejected from the chapel here under the establishment. The people who founded the Dissenting chapel at this place were congregational in their views of church government. Mr. Briscoe removed to Toxteth Park and died Sept. 1685, aged 96. He was succeeded at Walmsley by Mr. Thomas Key as appears from a certificate of his ordination in the possession of the writer, of which the following is a copy.

“ 10th day of the 7th month 1671.”

“ We do certify whom it may concern, that our dear brother Mr. Thomas Key in our judgment is competently qualified for the ministry, as hath also been certified according to the judgment of diverse reverend ministers of several persuasions. We do also certify, that he is unanimously chosen by the brethren of Walmsley to be their Teacher, and also he hath humbly accepted of that call. We do lastly certify, that he is ordained to that office in the name of Christ, and therefore he should be so received.”

“ THOMAS JOLLIE,

(Pastor of the Church which formerly met at Altham in  
Lancashire.)

RICHARD PRIESTLEY,

(Pastor of the Church of Christ in and about Kingston upon  
Hull.”)

When a Socinian minister was introduced into the Dissenting chapel at Walmsley, and he had made a confession of his faith, it is said, that the neighbouring ministers who had assembled to assist at his ordination were so much grieved that they withdrew and refused to take any part in the service. The endowment belonging to this chapel is about 30*l.* per annum besides a house for the minister.

WALTON, near Preston.—*Originally Orthodox*.—It is now converted into Cottages, and the rents are paid to the minister at Preston.—See Preston.

WARRINGTON.—Mr. Robert Yates, an able Orthodox divine was ejected from the parish church of this town. In 1672, he took out a license and preached publicly to many

of his former hearers. He died in Nov. 1678, aged sixty-six and was succeeded by his son Mr. Samuel Yates. Mr. Matthew Henry, when minister at Chester, frequently visited and preached at Warrington. Mr. C. Owen was probably the immediate successor of Mr. Yates, jun. He was followed by Mr. Felkin. Both these are said to have been sound in the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ according to the usual interpretation of Trinitarians. About sixty years ago a Mr. Seddon was minister here who is reputed to have been an Arian. He was followed by Dr. Enfield, whose Socinian doctrines caused most of the pious people to leave and build the Independent place of worship called Stepney Chapel. After Dr. Enfield, Mr. Bealey of Cockey Moor preached here about two years, and was succeeded by Mr. Broadbent who was minister of the place upwards of twenty years. Since his death Mr. Hutton was here a short time. Mr. Dimmock is the present minister. The latter ministers have all preached what are denominated Unitarian doctrines. The old place of worship was considerably smaller than the present chapel. The endowment is about 35*l.* per annum the greater part, if not the whole, is of Orthodox origin.

WIGAN.—This place and Tunley have been supplied alternately for near thirty years past by Mr. Dinwiddie a native of Scotland. Both places were built by the Orthodox and are endowed. The congregations are exceedingly small.

*The Unitarian Methodists* had their origin amongst the followers of Mr. Cooke formerly a minister amongst the Wesleyan Methodists, but who was expelled from that connexion in the year 1806. His friends built for him an excellent chapel at Rochdale which has since been sold to the Independents. After Mr. Cooke's death many of his hearers having embraced Unitarian sentiments formed themselves into a distinct society, retaining part of the plans common to the Wesleyans, but differing very far from them in doctrines. A yearly meeting of the brethren is held at some appointed place, in imitation of the Methodist

conference, at which a plan is drawn up appointing the preachers to their different stations for the ensuing year. They have several licensed rooms in Lancashire, mostly in the neighbourhood of Rochdale and Manchester, beside the chapels noticed in the above list, in which they have Sunday Schools and preaching. These lay preachers, besides the assistance they receive from Lady Hewley's Trustees, are encouraged in a more legitimate manner by the voluntary subscriptions of some of their wealthy friends in the County.

Many of the Unitarian ministers officiating in the chapels enumerated in the foregoing list share in the plunder of Lady Hewley's property, designed for the relief, of "*Poor and Godly Preachers of Christ's Holy Gospel*," beside those instances in which the fact is mentioned.

---

## LEICESTERSHIRE.

HINCKLEY.—*Originally Orthodox*.—The number of the congregation is almost reduced to nothing.

LEICESTER.—*Originally Orthodox*.

LOUGHBOROUGH and MOUNT SORRELL.—*Both originally orthodox*, but now united under one minister.

---

## LINCOLNSHIRE.

BOSTON.—*Built by the Unitarians*.

KIRKSTEAD.—*Originally Orthodox*.—At present neither minister nor congregation. The property has been for some years under litigation. The endowment large.

LINCOLN.—*Originally Orthodox*.—Endowment 60l. per annum.

---

## MIDDLESEX.

BRENTFORD.—*Originally Orthodox*.

HACKNEY.—*Built by the Unitarians*.

HAMPSTEAD.—*Originally Orthodox*.—Endowed.

NEWINGTON GREEN. *Do.*

## LONDON.

ESSEX-STREET, STRAND. — Built for the late Rev. T. Lindsey.

JEWIN-STREET.—This place was built about twenty years ago. The congregation removed from an old meeting-house in the Old Jewry: it was originally Orthodox.

MONKWELL-STREET. — *Originally Orthodox*.—The first minister the Rev. T. Doolittle, ejected in 1662.

SOMERS TOWN.—*Built by the Unitarians*.

SOUTH PLACE, Finsbury Square.—*Do.*

STAMFORD-STREET, Blackfriars Road.—Recently built by two congregations who before met in chapels erected for the orthodox. The proceeds of those chapels were applied towards the expense of the new building.

WORSHIP STREET.—Built about 1780 by four general baptist congregations.

YORK STREET.—Lately taken by Unitarians.

---

## NORFOLK.

DISS.—*Built by the Unitarians*.

FILBY.—*Originally Orthodox*.

HAPTON.— *Do.*

Endowment very large. Congregation almost extinct.

LYNN.—*Built by the Unitarians.* "

NORWICH. — *Originally Orthodox*. — Rebuilt 1756, for Dr. Taylor and his congregation.

YARMOUTH. — *Originally Orthodox*.

---

## NORTHUMBERLAND.

NORTH SHIELDS. — *Originally Orthodox*.

NEWCASTLE, Hanover Square, — *originally orthodox*. — Dr. Richard Gilpin, (See Non. Con. Mem. Vol. I. p. 386.) was one of the founders and first pastors of this place, and died here in 1700. The assistant minister then and for some time subsequent to the Doctor's death was Mr. Thomas Bradbury, the well-known champion of Orthodoxy, who dedicated some most orthodox sermons to this congregation. Mr. Benjamin Bennet, author of "The Christian Oratory," succeeded Dr. Gilpin as pastor, and died here Sept. 1, 1726; the present chapel was built for Mr. Bennet, and the day previous to his decease had been fixed upon for the opening. To him succeeded Dr. Samuel Lawrence, son of the excellent Mr. Lawrence, of Nantwich, the friend of Matthew Henry, who preached his funeral sermon. In 1733, Dr. Lawrence removed to Monkwell-street, London, to succeed the truly evangelical Daniel Wilcox, and was followed at Newcastle by Mr. Rogerson, who it is probable opened the door for Arianism in this hitherto orthodox society, he died in 1769.

---

## NOTTINGHAMSHIRE.

MANSFIELD. — *Originally Orthodox*.

NOTTINGHAM. *Do.* Endowment respectable. The change of sentiment took place about eighty years ago, when about thirty families withdrew and united with the Independents.

## OXFORDSHIRE.

BANBURY.—*Originally Orthodox.*

---

## SHROPSHIRE.

OLDBURY.—*Originally Orthodox.*

SHREWSBURY.                   *Do.*                   One of their first  
ministers the Rev. Mr. Tallents, ejected 1662.

WHITCHURCH. — *Originally Orthodox.* — Endowment  
large.

---

## SOMERSETSHIRE.

BATH—*Originally Orthodox.*

BRIDGEWATER.           *Do.*

CREWKERNE.           *Do.*

OAKHILL.               *Do.*

SHEPTON MALLETT.—*Do.*                   The Unitarian mi-  
nister of Oakhill preaches here occasionally. The endow-  
ment considerable.

TAUNTON. — *Originally Orthodox.* — The endowments  
considerable, but chiefly by persons who were not or-  
thodox.

YEOVIL.—*Originally Orthodox.*—But rebuilt. The last  
orthodox minister was an M.D. named Lobb. Endowment  
25l. to 30l. per annum.

## STAFFORDSHIRE.

COSELEY.—*Originally Orthodox*.—Well endowed. For nearly twenty years the Rev. William Edwards who was Orthodox was their pastor. He declined the ministry on account of ill-health about the year 1773. Mr. Small is the present minister.

STONE.—*Originally Orthodox*.—Was connected with Stafford. The endowment, if any, must be very small.

NEWCASTLE-UNDER-LINE. The old meeting-house was originally Orthodox; but a new place of worship has been built in that neighbourhood by the Unitarians.

TAMWORTH—Is now connected with Atherstone, and being an old place was no doubt originally Orthodox.

STAFFORD.—*Originally Orthodox*.—Vacant and going to ruins. The trustees possess the endowment, but the deeds of the chapel provide that if the worship should be discontinued, the funds should be paid to the nearest congregation of the same denomination.

WALSALL.—*Originally Orthodox*.—Endowment small. A Mr. Warner an Orthodox minister was their pastor for some years. A Mr. Jones who was also Orthodox succeeded him; during his ministry a gentleman of considerable influence borrowed the title-deeds and retained them in his possession, who with his friends procured the election of a second Mr. Jones whose religious principles were not esteemed correct by the church and pious part of the congregation on which account they were compelled to leave the old meeting-house. Mr. Bowen is the present minister.

WOLVERHAMPTON.—*Originally Orthodox*.—Built 1701. Endowments about 70l. per annum. First minister Joshua Reynolds; the second minister in whose time the meeting house was built, the Rev. J. Stubbs; he was truly Orthodox; he died in 1740. Mr. Holland was elected 1748 and left in 1754. Mr. Cole was settled 1759, and was pastor of the church twenty-one years. The Rev. Mr. Jameson was invited to be his successor and accepted the invitation; but

when he arrived at Wolverhampton was prevented entering upon his ministry by a minority of the congregation which had as their leader an individual deeply tinctured with Socinian sentiments under whose influence the Rev. S. Griffiths an Arian was elected. The Rev. J. Small was the first Unitarian minister who officiated in the old meeting-house for any length of time—he was followed by the Rev. J. Steward, who in 1816 abandoned Socinianism. At a meeting held on the first of September, Mr. Joseph Pearson and about twelve other persons signed a string of resolutions in which they declared themselves to be Unitarians. Mr. Pearson had long held the trust-deeds contrary to the wishes of his colleagues. Proceedings were instituted against Mr. Steward and the trustee who protected him which were stopped by the Lord Chancellor, and Mr. S. remains in possession by his Lordship's order.

---

## SUFFOLK.

BURY ST. EDMONDS.—*Originally Orthodox*.—And continued so till 1800. Endowment 70l. per annum.

FRAMLINGHAM.—*Originally Orthodox*.

IPSWICH—*Do.*

LOWESTOFFE. *Do.* Said to be now Independent.

PALGRAVE. *Do.*

---

## SURRY.

GODALMING.—G. B. modern.



## SUSSEX. .

BATTLE.—Built about thirty years ago by the Orthodox.

BRIGHTON.—*Built by Unitarians.*

BILLINGHURST.—G. B.—*Originally Orthodox.*

CHICHESTER. *Do.*

CUCKFIELD. G. B.

DITCHLING. G. B.

HORSHAM. G. B. *Do.*

LEWES. *Do.*

## WARWICKSHIRE.

ALCESTER.—*Originally Orthodox.*—Built about the year 1710.

ATHERSTONE. *Do.*

BIRMINGHAM, Old Meeting, and New Meeting.—Both *Originally Orthodox.*—Rebuilt by the Arians after the riots.

COVENTRY.—*Originally Orthodox.*—Mr. Tong, the biographer of Matthew Henry, was once the minister of this chapel.

KENILWORTH.—*Originally Orthodox.*—This place is now in Chancery at the instance of the Orthodox trustees, for the purpose of recovering it to the party upon which it was originally settled.

KINGSWOOD.—Not ascertained, but as our correspondent thinks it was probably built by the Arians or Socinians it may rank amongst the few which have been originated in that way.

WARWICK.—*Originally Orthodox.*—Mr. Carpenter, one of the former ministers, used to catechise the children publicly, by teaching and explaining the Assembly's Catechism.

## WESTMORELAND.

KENDAL.—*Originally Orthodox*.—Dr. Rotherham who educated young men for the ministry was Minister of this congregation for many years. He became an Arian, and the congregation is now Socinian. The chapel is liberally endowed, and the value of the property is improved by rebuilding, &c. by the congregation. Our correspondent says he believes this is the only chapel belonging to the Unitarians in this county.

---

## WILTSHIRE.

BRADFORD.—*Originally Orthodox*.—Endowed.

SALISBURY.               *Do.*               Endowed. Now used  
as a school-room by Wesleyan Methodists.

TROWBRIDGE.—*Originally Orthodox*.—Endowed.

WARMINSTER.           *Do.*

---

## WORCESTERSHIRE.

BROMSGROVE.—This place being upwards of a century old, there can be no doubt that it was originally orthodox. It is now occupied by the Methodists by permission of the Socinians, who, in order to retain possession of the chapel and funds, have a sermon there once a fortnight.

Our Correspondent laconically adds to the above statement, "scarcely any body attends."

CRADLEY.—*Originally Orthodox*.

DUDLEY.               *Do.*

EVESHAM.             *Do.*

KIDDERMINSTER.—*Built by the Unitarians.*

STOURBRIDGE.—*Originally Orthodox.*

## YORKSHIRE.

### *West Riding.*

BRADFORD.—*Originally Orthodox.*—The Endowment is considerable. The Chapel here was built about 1717. Before that period the people assembled for worship at Little Horton, the residence of the family of the Sharps, who were eminent for Scriptural piety, and at a place near Wibsey. In 1782 Mr. Harcastle was minister here, whose father, Mr. Thomas Harcastle, was ejected from Bramham, in Yorkshire, and was often the victim of persecution. One of his successors was John Smith, the son of Matthew Smith, who was minister at Mixenden and Warley, and published a small octavo volume on “Justification by the imputed Righteousness of Christ.” John Smith’s sentiments appear in a volume of sermons he published in 1737, containing five of his fathers’ and three of his own, with an account of his father’s life. He died in 1768: and probably was, what Dr. Doddridge has called “a Baxterian Calvinist.”

DONCASTER.—*Originally Orthodox.*—Endowed.

ELLAND CHAPEL AND SCHOOL.—An endowment, which is now upwards of 80*l.* per annum, was bequeathed previous to 1704. Of this bequest 15*l.* belongs to the chapel only and the rest relates as much to the School as to the Chapel, and the trustees are empowered either to unite them in one person, or to divide them. The proof which will be adduced of the early orthodoxy of Lidgét Chapel is equally applicable to that of Elland, because they were formerly conjoined; and the same minister officiated at both places. The low state of the congregation may be inferred from the following fact. After the last minister removed, the trustees

suspended public worship several months, and applied the endowment to defray some expences of repairs.

HALIFAX — *Originally Orthodox*.—The Endowment about 45*l.* per annum. Mr. O. Heywood was the founder of the dissenting interest at this place. Many families were accustomed to attend his ministry at Northowram, who, when King James issued his declaration for liberty of conscience, commenced building the Chapel here. For some time Mr. Heywood preached alternately at Halifax and Northowram. Early in the last century, Mr. Dawson was minister at this place. His father, Joseph Dawson, was ejected from Thornton Chapel, in Yorkshire, and was also the intimate and confidential friend of Mr. Oliver Heywood. Besides the blessing of having such a father, he was educated in Richard Frankland's academy. From these facts, we are warranted to infer that he imbibed the spirit, and adhered to the faith of the ancient nonconformists.

LIDGET. — *Originally Orthodox*.—The endowment upwards of 60*l.* per annum. This Chapel was built in 1695; and rebuilt in 1768; but the first chapel, erected on the same ground, was of an earlier date. No account can be obtained of the ministers, farther back than 1820; but something may be known from an old folio volume, which one of them bequeathed to the congregation and which yet remains on the Communion Table. It has been formerly much used; the title page is gone, the leaves are loose, mis-placed and some of them wanting; but the running titles are Original Sin—Repentance—Faith—Knowledge of Christ—Justification—New creature—Christ's gracious invitations—Christ dying for sinners—Christ's intercession, &c., &c. It is called a volume of Baxter's Works, but, in fact, it is David Clarkson's Sermons and Discourses. The venerable book shows what principles once animated the zeal of the preachers, and attracted the attendance, and warmed the hearts of the listening throng. It also forms a striking contrast to the enlightened and liberal notions which have since been read from the pulpit to the empty pews.

LEEDS.—Call-lane.—*Originally Orthodox*.—Endowed.

The congregation was originally gathered by Mr. Christopher Nesse, one of the ejected ministers, in 1672; and on his removal to London in 1675, Mr. Whitaker was called to succeed him; but the present chapel was not built till 1691—'Thomas Whitaker took the pastoral charge of this place in 1675, and was minister there thirty-four years. He is celebrated for extensive learning, and powerful abilities, for fervent piety, and exemplary excellence of character. His labours were great, and they were honoured with great success. What his doctrinal sentiments were, may be known from his works, and from the testimony of the celebrated Thomas Bradbury, who knew him well, and revered him highly, having lived some time in his family. He informs us, that Mr. Whitaker's "way of understanding the great doctrines of election, redemption, justification, conversion, and perseverance, was agreeable to the churches of England, Scotland, Holland, and Geneva." Preface to Thomas Whitaker's Sermons, 8vo. 1712. Mr. Whitaker was a member of the church at Althome, under the pastoral care of Mr. Thomas Jollie; and when he formed the church at Leeds, he conducted it on congregational principles. He was an intimate friend of Mr. Heywood; and fellow-prisoner with him in York Castle many months. This place had a very honourable commencement, and of the present generation of hearers it may be said, that their creed is not quite so scanty, nor are their negations so numerous, as those of modern Socinians of the newest fashion.

LEEDS.—*Mill Hill.—Originally Orthodox.*—Endowed, built in 1672. Mr. Richard Stretton and Mr. Cornelius Todd were the first ministers, in conjunction with two others. Mr. Stretton was a friend of Dr. Manton, and his funeral sermon was preached by Matthew Henry. Mr. Todd is said to have drawn up the Confession of Faith, sometimes bound up with the Assembly's Catechism. Mr. Sharp, Mr. Pendlebury, and others, who have followed as ministers of this chapel, were also Orthodox. It was during the ministry of Mr. Joseph Cappe, that the departure from Orthodox doctrine took place. Dr. Priestley became

minister of this Chapel in the year 1767, and was followed, in 1773, by Mr. William Wood, the father of Mr. G. W. Wood, who has been a writer in the present controversy. Mr. W. Wood died in 1808.

**ROTHERHAM.**—*Originally Orthodox.*—Endowed.—The first minister was John Heywood, who entered on his stated ministry here, in March 1693; he had the honour and happiness to be a son of Oliver Heywood, and a student in the academy of Richard Frankland. His father has left an interesting record of the solemn and impressive manner in which his ordination was conducted. Mr. Heywood removed from this place to Pontefract in 1695, and continued the Minister there till his death, September 2, 1704. His doctrinal sentiments were orthodox.

**SELBY.**—*Originally Orthodox.*—Endowed.—The present state of this place appears, from the account of Richard Wright, the Socinian itinerant, who says, “the present minister has very few hearers.”

**SHEFFIELD.**—*Originally Orthodox.*—Endowed.—This Chapel was built in 1678, for Robert Durant, the ejected minister from Crowle, in Lincolnshire; and was re-built on a larger scale, and in handsome style, for his successor, Timothy Jollie, the Son of Thomas Jollie, the ejected minister of Althome, in Lancashire. Blessed is that congregation which enjoys the services of such a man as Timothy Jollie; for he inherited the principles and virtues of his father; and was a very superior man, both for learning and goodness. He was the tutor of a flourishing Academy at Attercliffe; and the pastor of a numerous and respectable congregation at Sheffield, until his death, in 1714. Oliver Heywood, Richard Frankland, Thomas Whitaker, and Timothy Jollie, were the founders of Dissenting chapels, and the glory of Dissenting congregations in Yorkshire, and would have been an honour to any denomination. On Mr. Jollie's death, a majority of the Church members would have invited Mr. De la Rose, who had been Mr. Jollie's last assistant, but there was a majority of the congregation, together with the Trustees, in favour of Mr. John Wads-

worth; the latter prevailed, and Mr. De la Rose and his friends were under the necessity of withdrawing, and they built the Nether Chapel. At that period, however, both these ministers and their societies were Orthodox, and the division was not owing to any difference of opinion on those points which are of vital importance in the Christian scheme, and which they held in common, but which Unitarians unequivocally reject and deny. Mr. Wadsworth was minister of the upper-chapel till Christmas 1744—part of this time he was assisted by Mr. T. Jollie, jun. the son of his predecessor and of kindred sentiments. From the year 1740, he was assisted by his own son, Mr. Field Sylvester Wadsworth, who had been a student at Dr. Doddridge's Academy, but withdrew at the particular request of his tutor, on account of his having embraced the Arian hypothesis; and from that time downwards, the society has been sinking lower and lower till it has settled in Socinianism. Dr. Priestley then an Arian, (he became a Socinian while minister of Mill-hill Chapel, Leeds,) was a candidate to succeed the younger Mr. Wadsworth, who died at Sheffield, Dec. 3rd, 1758;—but he was unsuccessful, not on account of heterodoxy, for under the ministry of Mr. Haynes and the younger Mr. Wadsworth, the congregation had then most probably imbibed similar opinions, but on account of his imperfect delivery.

The ministers here have been—Messrs. Durant, Jollie, Jeremiah Gill, De la Rose, Wadsworth, Jollie, jun., Wadsworth, jun., Haynes, Evans, Dickinson, Naylor, Dr. Phillips. The last named gentleman has been minister here about 20 years. In connexion with this chapel, is Hollis's charity, which comfortably provides for 16 widows, each of whom receives a guinea every three weeks. The Orator who reads prayers, and teaches 40 or 50 children, receives 15 guineas per quarter, and has a good house in the Hospital-yard—and from the same fund, the minister of the upper chapel derives 30l. per annum.

STANNINGTON.—*Originally Orthodox*.—It appears that there was formerly an Episcopalian Chapel here, from which

Mr. Darwent was ejected in 1662. The church service was performed here until about the year 1740, when T. Marriott, an Orthodox dissenter, purchased a plot of land, near the old building, and erected a new Chapel, which he endowed. The first minister of the new chapel was Mr. Smith, who preached there about twenty years; he was succeeded by Mr. Hall, who professed orthodox sentiments, but became an Arian, and after preaching there nineteen years, departed to Rotterdam. An attempt was then made by the Trustees to introduce an Unitarian minister, but the Inhabitants were so opposed to it, that they consented to the appointment, in the year 1780, of Mr. Rhodes, a calvinistic divine, who officiated to a numerous congregation until 1785, when he removed to Sutton. The Trustees thereupon, contrary to the wishes and remonstrances of the Inhabitants, appointed Mr. Gibson, an Unitarian minister; in consequence of which, most of the hearers left the Chapel, some went to the nearest church, and others became members of the Independent Church, in Queen Street Chapel, Sheffield, (about five miles from Stannington) then under the care of the Rev. Jchoiada Brewer. Mr. Meanley succeeded to Mr. Gibson; and the present Minister is the Rev. Peter Wright, an Unitarian Minister. The congregation consists of about thirty or forty persons, though the chapel will contain 400 or 500, and the gentleman who claims the right of presentation to this chapel is Samuel Shore, Esq., of Meersbrook, one of the Trustees of Lady Hewley's Estates. The original chapel was amply endowed by the Will of Mr. Richard Spoone in the year 1652, for the maintenance of a minister, who was to be approved of by three of the next neighbouring ministry or the Feoffees or the greater part of them, for "honesty of life, soundness in doctrine, and diligence in preaching." What the Testator meant by "soundness in doctrine" is obvious from the following words in the preamble to his Will, "I desire, in the name of Jesus Christ, to bequeath my soul into the hands of God that gave it, hoping assuredly TO BE SAVED BY THE DEATH AND PRECIOUS BLOOD-SHEDDING OF JESUS CHRIST



MY REDEEMER, AND BY NO OTHER MERITS." Both the Church and Chapel endowments are now enjoyed by Peter Wright, the present Unitarian minister, who lives in Sheffield, and keeps a school, and therefore his diligence in preaching" is as questionable as his "soundness in doctrine."

THORNE AND STAINFORTH.—The chapel at Thorne was built in 1816, and that at Stainforth in 1817. They are three miles distant from each other, and are supplied by the same minister. Richard Wright glories much in the erection of these places, and with some appearance of reason, for they are the only chapels which his party have originated in the country of York.

WAKEFIELD.—*Originally Orthodox*.—Endowed.—The original Chapel stood where the burying ground now is. Joshua Sager was the first minister of whom we have any account, and he died in 1710. Thomas Whitaker, in his funeral sermon, described him as an able and faithful, a diligent and useful Minister of the Gospel, and bewails the heavy loss the people sustained by his death. That loss appears heavy, indeed, when we compare him with some of his successors. His character is thus delineated by Thomas Bradbury, "Mr. Joshua Sager was a good scholar, an hearty friend, a substantial, useful preacher, and of so blameless a conversation, as to have a good report of all men, and of the truth itself." In such men as these, Orthodoxy was justified of her Children. The present Chapel was built in 1752. Mr. Thomas Walker A. M. of Millhill Chapel, Leeds, preached at the opening November 1, 1752; his sermon was afterwards printed. The Reverend Jeremiah Aldred (the son of Reverend J. Aldred of Monton, and orthodox on his first coming to Wakefield and during a considerable portion of his services there if not to the last) was then minister of this congregation, and was succeeded by the late Mr. Turner in 1761.

*North and East Ridings.*

HULL, Bowl Alley Lane Chapel.—*Originally Orthodox.*—The first minister from 1662 to 1693 was Mr. Samuel Charles: his successor Mr. Billingsley, was a friend of Matthew Henry, he removed to London, and published many sermons which clearly shew his orthodoxy, &c. Mr. John Witter was the next minister, who was succeeded by Mr. Titus Cordingley who was probably an Arian.

There is also an Unitarian Baptist chapel in New-Dockstreet, which the congregation built or purchased.

MALTON.—*Originally Orthodox.*—Mr. Bartlett the present minister was educated at Mr. Scott's Academy, at Heckmondwike, and received a call to this chapel, and for several years preached with acceptance to an Orthodox congregation, when at length it was suspected that his views had changed, and the suspicion was confirmed by his introducing Mr. C. Wellbeloved, of York, into his pulpit. Much uneasiness resulted from this discovery, and the people (singularly enough) appealed to Lady Hewley's Trustees. These gentlemen took a different view of the case, and rewarded the public avowal by Mr. Bartlett of his new sentiments by giving him 20*l.* per annum instead of 10*l.* as theretofore. Some years ago, an attempt was made to induce Mr. Bartlett to resign his charge, and an annuity of 50*l.* per annum for his life was offered to him, with good security; he requested a month's time to consider, and after consulting with his Unitarian friends, he gave his answer, "I can have as much from another quarter, and I will not resign my charge." It is supposed, that Mr. Wellbeloved was actively engaged in procuring this determination; and his students now preach at the chapel, every alternate Sabbath on Unitarian tenets, printed notices of which are posted in the streets. An Independent Chapel has been erected a few years ago, in consequence of these occurrences. It is reported that some agreement has been

made with Mr. Bartlett, who holds the title deeds, to secure the delivering up of the chapel on his death or removal, to the Unitarians.

**WHITBY.**—*Originally Orthodox.*—Erected in 1715 by Mr. Leonard Wilde, a sail maker, who, at his death in 1732, left an estate to the chapel, which nearly fifty years ago, let for 24l. per annum.

**YORK.**—*Originally Orthodox.*—Liberal endowment. This chapel was erected in 1692, chiefly at the expense of Sarah Lady Hewley; and Dr. Thomas Colton, her chaplain, and afterwards her executor, was the first minister. In this Lady's character were combined extensive benevolence to men, and a humble reliance on the atonement of the Saviour for acceptance with God. In the Memoirs of O. Heywood we are told, that she was very kind to him while he was a prisoner in York castle: and in his diary, he mentions his visits to the excellent Lady Hewley, and her favours to him. When Mr. Heywood visited Lady Hewley, he usually preached in the chapel at York. During her life she was a liberal benefactress to the poor and especially to poor persecuted ministers of the Gospel; and sometime previous to her death she devoted, by deeds of trust, the whole of what was originally her own property, to charitable and pious uses, the annual produce of which is said to amount to 4000l., and is now chiefly applied to Unitarian purposes.

Dr. Colton was minister here till his death Nov. 16, 1731. Mr. John Hotham, a pupil of Mr. Jollie's, of Attercliffe was the Doctor's assistant and successor. He died Jan. 5, 1756, in his eighty-second year. Newcome Cappe, son of Mr. Cappe of Leeds was chosen to assist Mr. Hotham, on the death of Mr. Root, in June, 1755, and from that time, the departure from sound doctrine, if it did not actually commence then, was in all probability, more distinct and marked than before. The present average congregation in this place is said to be not more than forty or fifty.

There is also in this city a chapel held by the Unitarian Baptists which they purchased.

## WALES.

## CAERMARTHENSHIRE.

CAERMARTHEN.—*Originally Orthodox.*

CASTLE HOWELL.—*Do.*—Now a mixture of Arminians and Arians.

LLWYN-Y-GROES.—*Built by Unitarians.*

## CARDIGANSHIRE.

CAPEL-Y-GROES. }  
Y-STRAD. } *Built by Unitarians.*

PANT-Y-DEFAID. *Do.*

RHYD-Y-PARK.—*Originally Orthodox.*

## GLAMORGANSHIRE.

ABERDORE.—*Originally Orthodox.*

BLAEN-Y-GWRACH. *Do.*

BRIDGEND.—*Do.*—Raised by the labours of the Rev. Samuel Jones, A. M. ejected 1662. The ministers were invariably orthodox until 1806, when the majority of the church and congregation were expelled by the forcible introduction of Socinianism by the trustees. Endowment about 40l. per annum.

GELLIONEN.—*Originally Orthodox.*

MERTHYR TYDVIL.—*Built by Unitarians.*

NEATH. *Do.*

SWANSEA.—*Originally Orthodox*.—The chapel was built in 1698 for Mr. Stephen Hughes, an Independent minister and a decided Trinitarian ; after his death Mr. Palmer, an Orthodox minister, succeeded him. Mr. Solomon Harris succeeded Mr. Palmer, and preached at this chapel thirty-five years, and kept an academy for young ministers, and was decidedly Orthodox, as several persons now living can testify. Mr. William Howels succeeded and was supposed to have a leaning towards Arminianism, if not to Arianism, but after preaching many years he delivered up his charge, and Mr. Aubrey was invited to the place, who is a decided Unitarian, and the first minister of that denomination who has preached here. Mr. Howels disapproved of Mr. Aubrey's sentiments, and left his ministry, and the chapel altogether, and joined the Independents. The endowment is from 70l. to 100l. per annum.

---

## PEMBROKESHIRE.

TEMPLETON.—*Originally Orthodox*.

## SCOTLAND.

DUNDEE.—The few Unitarians in this town rented part of a house about seven years ago, which they fitted up at their own expense, and continue still to occupy. Before that time, they held their meetings in a masonic lodge.

EDINBURGH.—There is a chapel in the metropolis, which was finished and taken possession of about twelve months ago. It was built by the Unitarians themselves, and will accommodate from 300 to 400 sitters. There is, it is believed, no endowment. The number of members is stated at sixty, or from that to one hundred. The reader may take the largest of these two extremes; bearing in mind, that Edinburgh is the metropolis of Scotland, and contains at least 130,000 inhabitants. A good many people attended Mr. Fox's (of London) Lectures on the tenets of the party, when the chapel was opened:—but since that time the attendance has been a mere handful: there are few occasional hearers, and even these few consist, chiefly, it is thought, of commercial gentlemen from the south, of Unitarian principles.

GLASGOW.—The chapel in this city was built by the Unitarians. It is capable of accommodating 600 hearers, and was opened for public worship in 1812. The present average number of hearers may be reckoned at from fifty to one hundred, but generally nearer the former number than the latter, and sometimes below it: and this out of a population of upwards of 150,000.

PORT-GLASGOW.—Here is a chapel capable of accommodating 300 sitters. It is the upper part of a house, which

was built for the purpose in 1821 ; the under part being divided into two small dwelling-houses. The cost of the building was about 400*l.*—of which 220*l.* was raised by collections in England ; the remainder being obtained partly by subscriptions in the place and neighbourhood, and partly by loan, on interest, from a member of the small society. The average attendance on sabbaths is said to be about twelve ; and the heads of families avowedly of Unitarian principles, six or seven. They had a minister officiating for about half a year ; but have had none, with the exception of an occasional visit from one or other of their preachers for some time past.

PAISLEY.—About ten years ago the Unitarians of this place formed themselves into a “building society,” into which any who chose were admitted, whether they professed Unitarian principles or not. Each subscriber, when his subscription amounted to one pound, was entitled to five per cent interest per annum ; and the shares were fixed at 20*l.* each. With the money thus collected, in the course of several years, the society built a house, “a part of which” is occupied as a Unitarian place of worship : the house consisting of two stories ; the ground story being possessed as a dwelling house and the chapel : the church paying to the above society, for the use of the latter, ten pounds a year of rent. There is no endowment of any kind. The place will contain about 150 hearers ; and the average number in attendance is between seventy and eighty, out of a population of 50,000.

The extent of chapel accommodation belonging to the Unitarians in all Scotland, does not exceed 1500 sitters ; and to fill up that accommodation, there are not more than 300 persons, if indeed even this number does not include a considerable surplus !

## APPENDIX.

No. II.



### MANCHESTER COLLEGE, YORK.



THE Manchester College which was removed to York, Sept. 1, 1803, is the only public seminary which the Unitarians possess for training up young men for the ministry. The principal tutor is the Rev. Charles Wellbeloved, who occupies the chapel which was built and endowed by the Orthodox Lady Hewley, and which according to Mrs. Cappe (see p. 253. of her life) produced to the Rev. Newcome Cappe, Mr. W.'s predecessor 180*l.* per annum. It appears from the published accounts, that this college is maintained, partly by voluntary contributions and partly by exhibitions from charitable funds. The Report of the Manchester College, York, for 1821 (the latest to which the Editors have access) records the following exhibitions, viz.

CHAMBERLAINE'S FUND, HULL. From the 9th Vol. of the Report of Charitable Funds presented to Parliament, it appears, that Chamberlaine was a Draper, in Hull, and his will is dated Aug. 19, 1716. The bequests are "to the Poor and the Minister of a chapel in Hull, in which Mr. WITTER now preaches." This is the chapel in Bowl-alley



lane, which is at present occupied by Unitarians. By a reference to the list of chapels, it will be seen that the first minister of this chapel was Mr. Charles, who was ejected in 1662. He was imprisoned in 1682 and died in 1693. Mr. WITTER was chosen in 1705 and continued to be the minister for fifty years when he declined, owing to age and infirmity. Until 1757 the ministry was decidedly orthodox, when Mr. Beverley who entered upon the office that year began to preach *ambiguously*, and it was not until after his death that the preaching became avowedly Unitarian. Chamberlaine also bequeathed 10*l.* a year to support one scholar of *godliness and piety*, under a *judicious, godly, and faithful* tutor. There can be no doubt that by the term "*faithful*" Chamberlaine intended "*of orthodox sentiments*;" and the orthodoxy of Chamberlaine himself is equally unquestionable. Yet this exhibition is annually made to the Manchester College, York.

BUTTERWORTH'S FUND, MANCHESTER.—While the reader will generally be disposed to lament the misappropriation of Orthodox funds to Socinian purposes, he cannot but admire the ingenuity with which a charity specifically and expressly designed for the *apprenticing of poor boys to trades*, is made applicable to the educating of *young gentlemen for the ministry*. The following is extracted from Aston's Picture of Manchester:—"Ann Butterworth (by deed 4th of April, 1735) gave 500*l.* the interest of which is to be applied to the *putting out and binding apprentice children of poor Protestant Dissenters* (not excepting other Protestants who have not had relief from any town or parish) and for assisting *such children* at the expiration of their respective *apprenticeships*." By an indescribable device, the Manchester College, York, obtains from this source 16*l.* per annum.

MRS. CLOUGH'S FUND, LIVERPOOL.—Mrs. Clough's Will is dated the 14th of June, 1760, in which she "First, commits her soul to God *through the mediation of Jesus Christ*."

She bequeaths two seats or pews, her property in the Dissenting Chapel, Kaye-street, Liverpool, then decidedly orthodox: and to the poor of that chapel, and of another in Park-lane, within Ashton, she leaves 10*l.* respectively. There is also a bequest of 100*l.* to the trustees of a Fund in London for the relief of Dissenting Ministers' Widows. The Funds of this Orthodox widow, settled by deeds executed in her life time and confirmed in her will, furnished to the Socinian College, at York, in 1818, 45*l.*, in 1821, 30*l.*

**LADY HEWLEY'S FUND.**—This is the richest source of revenue to Unitarianism in general, and to the Manchester College, York, in particular. No less than **ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY POUNDS** are annually appropriated to the education of young men for the very purpose of denying, and endeavouring to extinguish, the belief of those doctrines of the deity and atonement of Christ, in the faith of which Lady Hewley lived, from which alone she had consolation in the prospect of death, and to the dissemination of which, she designed that her property should be devoted when she was no more. Could she have foreseen that one farthing of that property would have been withdrawn from the purposes nearest her heart, the deeds, expressive as they are of her sentiments and designs, would not have received her signature. The reader is referred for a more particular account of this lady and her charities, to the article in the Appendix under that head.

The Report of the Manchester College, York, for 1818, contains exhibitions which do not appear in the Report for 1821: viz.

**THE TRUSTEES OF THE DISSENTING CHAPEL, SHREWSBURY**, (which was originally orthodox) the interest of a legacy—and **THE TRUSTEES OF CROOK'S-LANE CHAPEL, CHESTER**. This is the chapel where the illustrious **MATTHEW HENRY** once preached; and it is heart-rending to think of the extinction of the light which once shone there, and of the

purposes to which the funds connected with it are now applied.

There appear from the list given in 1821, to have been FORTY ministers educated at this college during the eighteen years preceding; and of these, ONE is dead—NINE are unemployed—Two have gone to Scotland; and of the remaining TWENTY-EIGHT, more than TWENTY occupy places of worship which were originally orthodox.

## A P P E N D I X.

No. III.



### DR. WILLIAMS'S CHARITIES.

---

#### **Original Trustees.**

(Appointed by the Will which is dated June 26, 1711.)

Rev. William Lorimer  
William Tong  
Matthew Henry  
Benjamin Robinson  
Joseph Boyse  
Dr. Oldfield  
E. Calamy  
Zachary Merrel  
John Evans  
William Harris  
Thomas Reynolds  
Isaac Bates  
Jeremy Smith  
———Read, and

Messrs. John Morton  
Edmund Farrington, junior  
William Adee  
Jonathan Collyer  
Benjamin Sheppard  
Francis Barkstead  
———Archer  
Richard Watts  
Isaac Honywood  
George Smith

**Present Trustees.**

Rev. Abraham Rees, D. D. F. R. S.

Thomas Tayler

Thomas Belshan

John Barrett

Thomas Rees, L. L. D.

Eliezer Cogan

Robert Aspland

A. Crombie, D. C. L.

Archibald Barclay, D. D.

and

——— Geary

John Wansey

John Towgood

William Esdaile

Isaac Solly

John Bentley

John Holt

R. Solly

James Gibson

James Esdaile

Samuel Nicholson

David Martineau, Esquires.

**Librarian.**

Rev. John Coates

**Secretary and Solicitor.**

J. Wainwright, Esquire.

**Receiver.**

R. Webb Jupp, Esquire.

DANIEL WILLIAMS, D.D., was born at Wrexham, in Denbighshire, about 1644, “ and was amongst the very first young men who had the courage to identify themselves with those venerable confessors who had been ejected from their respective charges by the Act of Uniformity.” He became first, Chaplain to the Countess of Meath, in Ireland, then Pastor of the Presbyterian Congregation, Wood-street, Dublin, and finally settled with a numerous congregation in Hand-alley, Bishopsgate-street, London. His death took place on Jan. 26, 1715—16. when he was about 73 years of age.

Dr. Williams was a man of great abilities, high respectability, and of tried and established Orthodoxy; for having published some Tracts against the Antinomians, he was *accused of Socinianism*, but was *completely and most honourably vindicated from the charge*. His intimate companions and friends were, the famous Richard Baxter, Dr. Bates, Mr. Howe and Mr. Alsop. Although a man of large estate he observed great frugality in his expenses, that he might devote the principal part of his fortune to pious and benevolent purposes; and at his death he bequeathed his property (estimated at 50,000*l.*) to trustees for the following objects: viz.

1. *Missions to the Heathen and to Ireland*, which are no longer under the control of the Trustees.

2. *Exhibitions for Students at the University of Glasgow*. Eight students now receive 40*l.* each per annum while undergraduates, and 45*l.* per annum when graduates.

3. *A public Library for Dissenters*.\* The sum allowed by the Court of Chancery out of the Doctor's estates, not

\* So great a change has taken place in the management of this Library, that Orthodox ministers are now obliged to solicit the permission of a Unitarian Trustee, before they can enter its precincts; and complaints have been made repeatedly and without contradiction, that the MSS. which are freely conceded to the inspection of Unitarians, are prohibited to the Orthodox.

See Investigator, No. XVI. Ivimey's History of the English Baptists, Vol. III. p. 12.

being enough to finish the building in Red Cross-street, London, it was completed by the joint contributions of Independents, Baptists, and Presbyterians.

4. *The establishment of Schools in Wales.*

5. \* *A Fund to be applied to Miscellaneous Uses*,—One fifth of which is expressly destined to such “Preachers of the word of Christ, as are poor, ORTHODOX and moderate.”

6. *An Endowment to the Presbyterian Meeting-houses, at Wrexham and Burnham, Essex.*

That Dr. Williams died as he lived, firmly and warmly orthodox, is evident from the following expressions in his Will (which is dated June 26, 1711,) “I commit my soul to my FAITHFUL REDEEMER, who I hope firmly has *united me to himself*, and *will present me spotless* to his Father and my Father, in the VIRTUE OF HIS ALL SUFFICIENT MERITS.” The choice which he made of Trustees is also clear and decisive on this point; for six of them wrote expressly in favour of Trinitarian sentiments.

Dr. JOSHUA OLDFIELD published “A brief, practical, and pacific Discourse of God: and of the Father, Son, and Spirit, and of our concern with them.” 1721.

Dr. EDMUND CALAMY, who was a zealous advocate for the doctrine of the Trinity, delivered a course of Sermons upon the subject, which he afterwards published, entitled,

\* The appropriation of this fund as intended by Dr. Williams, may be explained by the following calculation how £500 are to be divided, which was confirmed by the Master’s report of June 30, 1737, and Order of Court thereon dated Nov. 30, 1737, viz.

	£.	s.	d.
1—8th Bibles, Catechisms, &c.	62	10	0
1—10th Minister’s Widows	50	0	0
1—5th Ministers	100	0	0
1—8th To put boys apprentice	62	10	0
1—8th To students	62	10	0
Ministers in North Wales	108	6	8
Ministers in South Wales	54	3	4
<hr/>			
	£500	0	0

“Thirteen Sermons concerning the Doctrine of the Trinity preached at Merchants’ Lecture, Salter’s Hall, together with a vindication of that celebrated text, 1 John v. 7. from being spurious, and an explanation of it upon the supposition of its being genuine, in four Sermons preached at the same lecture, 1719, 1720.

The Rev. Messrs. W. TONG, B. ROBINSON, T. REYNOLDS, and I. SMITH, united to publish “The Doctrine of the ever blessed Trinity stated and defended by four London Ministers.”

The Trinitarian sentiments of the Rev. Messrs. MATTHEW HENRY, LORIMER, MERREL, EVANS, HARRIS, BATES, READ, all of whom were ministers of the gospel, are evident throughout their works; and that the Lay Trustees were like minded, it is impossible to doubt.

It may be added that the Rev. J. BOYSE, of Dublin, whom Dr. W. appointed to be one of the four trustees to manage his bequest for Ireland, wrote “A vindication of the true divinity of our blessed Saviour, &c.”

He gave his estate at Cetworth, Huntingdonshire, to the Society for propagating Christian Knowledge in Scotland, “so long as it should send and maintain a competent number of well qualified ministers, in infidel foreign countries, to endeavour *their conversion to GOD IN CHRIST.*”

That Dr. Williams, versed, as a man of his observation must have been, in the obliquities of human nature, was not without some forebodings of the perversion which has actually taken place in the administration of his benefactions, by subsequent trustees, is apparent in the following almost prophetic language of his Will. Investing his trustees with the usual powers, he adds, “But to employ to the uses and purposes *as in conscience they will be obliged to do if they accept this trust.*” He requires his trustees to nominate such persons in the room of those deceased “as they shall judge *faithful and suitable*” and the persons elected from time to time “shall SOLEMNLY ENGAGE TO BE FAITHFUL IN THE MANAGEMENT of what they undertake.”



But in the impressive language of a judicious writer in the *Congregational Magazine*, for Feb. 1825.—

“His valuable property is now in other hands;—in the hands of gentlemen who flatter themselves “that had he lived till now, amidst increasing light, there is reason to believe that he would have imbibed what they think more rational and enlarged views of Christian doctrine.” But as he never did imbibe those views, but opposed and loathed them, how can they honestly employ it for the propagation of those sentiments which he abhorred?

“Let them ask the public, aye, and their own consciences too, what Dr. Williams meant, when he declared ‘that the profits were to be employed for the glory of God, and the promotion of pure unmixed Christianity?’ Was it not that Christianity which the Assembly’s Catechism teaches, and which his own writings exhibit?

“The perusal of the following close to the last solemn testament of the Doctor, will convince every candid reader that these gentlemen have contracted a fearful responsibility. “I beseech the blessed God for Christ Jesus’ sake, the head of his church, whose I am, and whom I desire to serve, that this my will may, by his blessing and power, reach its end and be faithfully executed. Obtesting in the name of this great and righteous God, all that are, or shall be concerned, that what I design for his glory to the good of mankind, may be honestly, prudently, and diligently employed to those ends: as I have to the best of my judgment directed.”

This touching appeal is treated by the Unitarians in their *Monthly Repository* for February, 1825, (published in March) with a mingled levity and bitterness, which is but too characteristic of the tendency of Socinianism to destroy the delicacy of moral feeling, and to deaden the sense of shame. It is in the following terms, that they set public opinion at defiance, and render it doubtful whether they believe in the existence of conscience or not—(at least they treat with ridicule the supposition that there is any conscience among the present trustees of Dr. Williams’s Cha-

rities;) viz.—“In their last Monthly Gazette (the Congregational Magazine) they give an account of the late Dr. Williams’s Charities; and having published a list of the trustees they put it to *those gentlemen’s consciences* with *edifying simplicity*, how they can keep these charities in their own hands, and not rather hasten to transfer them to sound believers in the Assembly’s Catechism.”! By not doing so remark the Congregationalists (hard name for *such simple Christians*) “These gentlemen have contracted a fearful responsibility” at least in the judgment, as they put it, of the candid!”

The reader cannot fail to observe the point of all this. The Congregational Magazine gives those trustees credit for honesty and conscience: but this is disowned with scorn by the public organ of those very trustees. The Congregationalists are said to display an “*edifying simplicity*,” and to be “*simple Christians*,” for being so weak and ignorant as to appeal to “**THOSE GENTLEMEN’S CONSCIENCES**”! Be it so:—but, let it be remembered, that this is not the accusation of the Orthodox; it is the boastful avowal of the Unitarians. They virtually acknowledge (which is indeed undeniable) that the Assembly’s Catechism embodies the principles of Dr. Williams’s faith, and that all the purposes for which he bequeathed his ample fortune coincide with the doctrines therein contained;—they own that on the other hand the present trustees disbelieve those doctrines, and employ the Doctor’s own money in the endeavour to extinguish them; and yet they treat with ridicule an appeal on that very ground “**TO THOSE GENTLEMEN’S CONSCIENCES**.”! The Orthodox congregationalists have no wish to exchange the “*simplicity*” of the gospel for the “*cunning craftiness*” of Socinianism: but until this scornful prohibition is withdrawn, they will not venture to repeat the imputation of honesty and conscience to Unitarian Trustees. The Unitarians may for a season continue thus to chuckle over the “*edifying simplicity*” of those who could be “*such simple Christians*” as to appeal “**TO THOSE GENTLEMEN’S CONSCIENCES**!”

but the Orthodox are not so credulous as to expect a voluntary restitution of perverted funds to their original and legitimate purposes. They were aware that a leading Trustee of these very charities, had asserted "That Trustees ARE NOT BOUND BY THE WILL OF THE TESTATOR: but must be left to act *according to their own discretion in the application of Trust Funds:*" but they were hardly prepared to see a principle so subversive of the rights of individuals and of public justice, sanctioned and avowed in the official publication of the English Unitarians.

## APPENDIX.

No. IV.



### LADY HEWLEY'S CHARITY.

---

#### **Original Trustees.**

Richard Stretton, Senior, Gentleman	}	London.
Nathaniel Gould, Esq.		
Thomas Marriott, Esq.		
John Bridges, Merchant		
Thomas Nisbett, Merchant		
Thomas Colton, Gentleman—York		
And		
James Windlow, Gentleman—Yarum.		

---

#### **Present Trustees.**

John Pemberton Heywood, Esquire  
Benjamin Heywood, Esquire  
Samuel Shore, Senior, Esquire  
Samuel Shore, Junior, Esquire  
Thomas Lee, Esquire  
Thomas Walker, Esquire  
Daniel Gaskell, Esquire.

“Trustees cannot be charged with dishonest *malversation*, unless they apply funds destined for a public object to their own private emolument.”—*Monthly Repository*, 20 Vol. 158.

LADY SARAH HEWLEY, the only child and heiress of Robert Woolrich, Esq. Benchet, Gray's Inn, was born in 1627, and died 23rd August, 1710, aged 83.

Sir John Hewley, knight, her husband, represented the City of York in Parliament, in the years 1676, 1677, and 1678.

Lady Hewley left no child, brother, sister, nephew, or niece.

Her Ladyship's sentiments relating to religious doctrine were decidedly Orthodox, and of this there is the most abundant and satisfactory evidence. She witnessed all the great struggles which took place in England for civil and religious liberty, and was upwards of 60 years of age when the memorable Revolution of 1688 took place. Her residence, which was partly in York, and partly at Bell Hall, four miles from that city, gave her opportunities of visiting those eminent men, Oliver Heywood, and others, during their confinement in York Castle for non-conformity. The Orthodox sentiments of these persons are known to every one; and her Ladyship relieved their necessities out of her ample fortune, and "was not ashamed of their chains." She attended the Dissenting Chapel in St. Saviour's-gate, York, which had been erected and endowed chiefly by herself, and which is now occupied by the Rev. Charles Wellbeloved, an Unitarian minister, and the Theological Tutor of the Unitarian Academy, York.

Her Ladyship was interred in St. Saviour's-gate Church, and on her monument was inscribed the following scriptural passage, viz.

*"Among the dead IN CHRIST that shall rise first."*\*

In the introductory words of her last will (to which she added a codicil only two days before her death) she distinctly expresses her faith and hope in the doctrine of the atonement, to the following effect, viz. "Having first committed my immortal soul into the hands of my dear Redeemer, *to be washed in his blood* and made meet to be partaker of the inheritance of the Saints; and leaving my vile body to be disposed of by my executors with as little

\* 1 Thess. iv. 16.

cost and ceremony as may be." These were not mere formal words, introduced into a will without any meaning, but they express her ladyship's Christian humility, as well as her belief in the great doctrine of the atonement, to the subversion of which, her ladyship's trustees now principally devote her property. The funeral sermon preached on the occasion of her ladyship's death by Dr. Colton, minister of St. Saviour's-gate Chapel, and one of the executors of her will, is replete with Orthodox sentiments. He says, "multitudes will feel the loss of her; if her private charities were all known they would amaze you; her silver streams ran along the vallies to water the adjacent parts. Many that knew not the spring head, when they find the stream dried up will know the reason when they hear that Lady Hewley is dead." "Her sinful infirmities she bitterly bemoaned." "What could keep up her relish of her religious exercises when they were so fatiguing and spending to the body but some prelibation of God's love in them, and an unquenchable thirst after the everlasting enjoyment of him." "When any person told her of some good work she had done, she would sometimes answer with divine Mr. Herbert, '*yes, if it were sprinkled with the blood of Christ.*'" "*She thought none had more need of the merits of a Saviour to justify and save her.*"

Dr. Colton referring to the settlement of her estates for charitable purposes, adds, "some of her works went before her as a memorial before God: others follow, to perpetuate and perfume her name in the churches, to continue her serviceableness upon earth," &c. This undoubtedly was her intention, and she little imagined, when she was executing the deed of settlement, that her charity would, by being thus perverted, become the means of inflicting the deadliest blow upon the principles which she meant to promulgate and support in the northern counties.

Lady Hewley also directed the Assembly's Catechism to be taught to the poor widows residing at the Alms-houses, which she founded in Tanner-row, York, and it is perhaps unnecessary to state that this direction has been long since

disregarded, and the poor old women are now taught Unitarian Catechisms.

Lady Hewley's charities were founded by two deeds of settlement, prepared by counsel, and dated in the years 1704 and 1707 ; and the following are the purposes to which her estates were to be applied, viz.

1st. Nine poor widows, or unmarried women of the age of 50 years or upwards ; and a sober discreet and pious poor man who might be fit to pray with them twice a day. The yearly sum of 60*l.* was to be distributed amongst them, and an allowance of money for catechisms ; and the alms-houses in Tanner-row were to be occupied by them.

2nd. The relief of *poor godly preachers* of Christ's holy gospel.

3rd. The relief of *poor widows of poor and godly preachers* of the gospel.

4th. For encouraging *the preaching of the gospel in poor places*.

5th. Exhibitions *for educating young men for the ministry* or preaching of the gospel, not exceeding five such young men.

6th. In relieving godly persons *in distress*.

There is a provision made in each deed for having a primary regard in the distribution of the charities to such objects thereof as should be in York, Yorkshire, and other northern counties in England.

The estates which were conveyed to Trustees for the purposes before stated, are the following, viz.

Annual Rental.

\*Haya Park Estate, near Knaresborough . . 1200*l.*

West Ayton, near Scarborough . . . . . 1500*l.*

Skelton, near York	} The rental of this Property
Eston, near Whitby,	
York . . . . .	

is not ascertained.

No doubt whatever can exist of Lady Hewley's intention to encourage and support Orthodox sentiments.

\* The total is said to exceed 4000*l.* per annum.

The *law* on this subject is quite as clear as was the *intention* of the Foundress ; because Unitarianism, as it is called, was not only excluded from the Toleration Act, but by an Act passed in 1698, (*only six years before the date of the first settlement,*) it was declared to be an offence, and on a second conviction the offender was subjected to three years imprisonment. Unitarian ministers, therefore, even if there had been any, could not legally be the objects of the settlement ; and in this case the law fully establishes the undoubted intention of Lady Hewley. A denial of this would be an impeachment of the validity of the deeds. Mr. J. P. Heywood, one of the present Trustees, is an eminent barrister in Yorkshire, and therefore is well acquainted with the law, and must be aware that the present mode of applying this charity to Unitarian preachers, cannot be justified. It is indeed lamentable to find the venerated name of "Heywood," and a descendant of Mr. Nathaniel Heywood, "the honour of the family" (as his brother, Oliver Heywood, styled him,) and the ejected minister of Ormskirk, in Lancashire (see Ormskirk Chapel in the Appendix) in the present list of the distributors of Lady Hewley's charities amongst the Socinians ; and it is the more remarkable that this gentleman is a magistrate, and therefore by law he is required to be a member of the Church of England, and a communicant at the Sacramental table, and thus in the most solemn manner he has declared his belief in Orthodox doctrines, as a qualification for the high office which he sustains.\*

\* The absurdity of this test is most clear. A gentleman whose *name* the writer of this article would be proud to give, who is a person of fortune, honour, and attainments, in whom the country would gladly confide, *who holds the doctrinal sentiments of the Church of England*, and yet has declined, though frequently requested, to be put into the Commission of the Peace, because he is a Dissenter, and refuses to conform to the Church. Unitarian magistrates, however, who might also be *named*, who, although they totally reject the doctrinal sentiments of the Church of England, have no scruples in submitting to the test ; of course, we are not to be understood as referring to Mr. Heywood ; nor to Lord Gifford, *who is also a Churchman*.—His Lordship's *rapid* and *brilliant* career has, indeed, astonished the nation ! A Solicitor's Clerk, Barrister, Whig, Tory,



It is therefore obvious, 1st. That Lady Hewley did not intend this charity for the Unitarian preachers: 2nd. That there were during her life no recognised Unitarian ministers in England: and 3rd. If there had been any such, and if Lady Hewley had intended to favour them, the law would not have sanctioned it.

A very valuable collection of papers relating to the private history of this charity is still preserved. Amongst others, is a narrative of the manner in which the property passed into the hands of Unitarian Trustees and Managers, in the hand writing of Mr. Robert Moody, of Walmgate in York, and afterwards of Handsworth near Sheffield, who was a Trustee of the charity for about thirty years (viz. from 1740 to 1770 as we collect from the papers) and received his appointment from the original Trustees, nominated by Lady Hewley herself, or the survivors of them.

This gentleman was appointed by his colleagues to value the Haya Park Estate, which he did on the 29th April 1755, and the following is a copy of his report, viz.

“ Haya Park is a very compact Estate well watered and well fenced with white thorn hedges which grow straight and tall, an evident proof the land is naturally good but very bare of timber. The Estate is on a plain considerably lower than the lands near the town of Knaresborough, but not so flat but the lowest part is capable of carrying off the winter rains provided proper drains was made which that part of the lands wants very much. The soil I have observed is naturally good, being a loomy earth a mixture of clay and sand. That which abounds the most with clay not too strong for Barley, and that which abounds the most with sand not too light for wheat. *I look upon the lands if in good order suitable for grass or corn and capable of being advanced*

Dissenter, Churchman, Unitarian, Trinitarian, Recorder of Bristol, Solicitor General, Attorney General, Member of the House of Commons, Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, Master of the Rolls, and a British Peer; all these my Lord Gifford is, or has been within a very few years. Still brighter prospects attend him as the presumptive, Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain, Keeper of the King's Conscience, and the distributor of the immense patronage of the Crown in the Church of England.

*to double the rent, and the tenants still to have good penny-worths. But I do not mean that there is the least prospect of improvements by the present tenants but the contrary which are a set of poor idle drunken ignorant fellows, ignorant I mean in the rules of good husbandry except Laycock and his management is not to be commended. As to the others, the little time I was at Knaresborough I could learn that Wednesday the Market-day and the Sabbath is commonly spent at the ale-house, nights and days, and the truth of this report is confirmed by the state of their farms the land is miserably run and full of weeds their home steads has all the marks of poverty and idleness, nor could I see one amongst the whole that had a proper stock of cattle to his farm. What would make this Estate valuable to a set of good tenants is of little service to the present, which is good roads, winter and summer, to market, and for bringing tillage to the land, the most remote farm not exceeding 3 miles, measured the nearest at one mile where corn sells, as I am informed, as well as in any market in Yorkshire. To sum up the whole the tenants are poor and so is the land; so that the land cannot help the tenants, nor the tenants the land, that the longer they are continued in this condition, the greater evils must arise both to landlords and tenants. I cannot account for the above evils, other ways than by letting the tenants have their farms so much under value, suffering them to have too much land in each farm more than they can manage, and the neglect of the Trustees in not putting a stop to these evils long ago."*

At the time this report was made (viz. 1755) the estate let for only 408*l.* per annum, although in the year 1642 it had let for 600*l.* on a \*lease for twenty years!!! The several estates let altogether for 1051*l.* but Mr. Moody thought they might have let for 2000*l.*

We give Mr. Moody's narrative in his own words, viz.

"Lady Hewley was a Protestant Dissenter and in her life gave large charities to the ministers of that denomination. Before her death she settled sundry estates to seven trustees, all which were dissenters, and such as have been chosen since the death of

\* The lease here referred to was granted to Richard Baynes and Richard Taylor both of the city of York.

the original trustees the same. A copy of the first settlement is annexed, the other dated April 26, 1707, exactly the same covenants, the same trustees, and same uses, except what relates to an hospital which she erected herself at York, in which deed of trust she refers to a book of rules and orders for the management of the poor *agreeable to her own sentiments in religion*. And in case the trustees was disturbed in the execution of these orders by civil or ecclesiastical power, that the 60*l.* per annum appointed for the maintenance of the poor of the Alms-house to be disposed of according to the direction of this annexed deed of trust, so long as the interruption continued. The rental of all the estates about four years ago did not exceed 105*l.* per annum, but capable of very great improvement, as will appear by the following narrative.

“ The first of my seeing the estate at Haya Park was in April, 1755. I knew the estate contained 1432 acres, and that the rental was 403*l.* 9*s.* I was surprized to find the quality of the land so much better than I expected. At a meeting of the trustees September following, I told the trustees that I had viewed every farm in the estate, and *that it was capable of being advanced to double the rents without oppressing the tenants*—that the present tenants had neglected the drains which in many places was grown up and also the fence ditches to the great prejudice of themselves and the estate. *The same meeting an order was made that I should have power to advance the estate.* None of the tenants would accept the terms offered them, accordingly such as would not give security to quit their farms Lady-day, 1757, was ordered to be ejected. The meeting following April 14, 1756, one of the trustees proposed to the trust to make an allowance out of the charity to a \*minister of 60*l.* per annum *which I opposed, believing it contrary to the deed of trust especially as the person had about 100*l.* or 120*l.* per annum, exclusive of any allowance from this charity and also contrary to an order made and signed the year before by the trustees then present, viz. that no minister should be a partaker of any distribution from the charity who has an annual income, exclusive of such distribution of 60*l.* in a market town, or 40*l.**

\* The Rev. Newcome Cappe, of York.

*in a village*; this put a stop to the proposal for that meeting. It is necessary here to observe one of the trustees was against the estate being advanced, alleging it was reflecting dishonour upon two trustees lately dead that had the management of this estate. *I am informed that after the meeting, the gentleman that wanted 60l. for his friend proposed to the trustee that was against the estate being advanced, that if he would use his interest to procure his friend 60l. he would use his, if the estate might be advanced as little as possible but as he had pleaded for an advance, it would be too notorious to insist of its being continued at the present rents.* At the next meeting, Sept. 8, 1756, this proposal of allowing the minister 60l. per annum, was renewed only in a different shape, alleging his present necessities, that when he came to the place he was in debt and he was under a necessity of keeping house, and that it was only asked for the present distribution 30l. to help to purchase household goods. As it was only asked for that one time I consented and signed, hoping it might reconcile all differences *although I disliked the thing*; but the next meeting they shewed their design more openly by proposing the continuance of it. Then \*I protested against it, refused signing the yearly accounts and distributions ever since, as it appears a partial and unequal distribution to me, the most indigent having not above 10l. per annum and many of them not above 6l., and many cases neglected for want of money as will appear by the books. The same meeting 8th of Sept. 1756, *I informed the Trustees that I would undertake to let the estate at 895l. per annum, if they approved of the same,* and desired they would appoint a meeting at Knaresborough the next month, in which parish the estate is, and I would appoint the farmers that had proposed taking the greatest number of farms to meet us, that no tenant might be admitted, but such as was agreeable to all the Trustees; the value of each farm I gave in was at the foot. The Trustees severally protested that they could not attend; at last, it was resolved that Mr. Dawson a manager in the Trust should meet me in the beginning of October in order to let the estate as above. *A few days after the meeting I was informed that after the business of the trust was finished and before the rest of the trustees parted, they privately determined*

\* A Copy of this Protest is with the Papers.

*that the estate should not be let as agreed upon in the meeting.* To be satisfied whether my information was true, I wrote to one of the Trustees that I thought was more influenced by a majority than judgment. A copy of his answer is as follows. "Sir, The Trustees at our late meeting were much moved at the great distress the old tenants at Haya Park laboured under, and were very inclinable to hear what other proposals upon further thoughts might be made by them at that and Mr. Dawson's meeting at Knaresborough, as well as to hear what proposals were made by the new people who were to enter into terms about the estate, but you will hear from Mr. Dawson the Trustees statements (who are absent) more at large. I am, your most obedient servant, H. Rich, Bullhouse, 2nd of Oct. 1756."

"It will be proper here to observe that the old tenants had been treated with several times, and would not comply to the terms offered, and afterwards was permitted to make their own proposals, the most they would give, which was refused by the trust before any stranger was treated with. When this letter came to hand I did not think it proper to summon the farmers to meet us till I see Mr. Dawson and hear the Trustees sentiments more fully. Mr. Dawson told me the Trustees had determined not to have the estate let till after another meeting. I asked when and where; he answered he did not know, but so soon as it was resolved upon he would let me know, added that he was directed to look over the estate himself and also hear what proposals the old tenants would further make. Accordingly he viewed the estate. I desired he would shew me his valuation; he pretended he had not drawn it up intelligibly; when he got home he would send it me, the letter I received from him was as follows. 'Sir; I have but just time to save the post and acquaint you, that Saturday afternoon Mr. Lee received a letter from Mr. Shore, wherein he and Mr. Rich fixed Thursday next for our meeting at the Stafford Arms in Wakefield, at one o'clock. Since I came home I have been tyed closed to business that I could not send you the remarks I made of Haya Park, I am, Sir, your humble servant, I. Dawson. Morley, 25th Oct. 1756.'

"At this meeting Mr. Dawson produced his valuation, which I give opposite to my own that both may appear in one view; and it was proposed to me to let the estate on these terms, Mr. Dawson

alleging it was the full value. In answer I told them *I could not comply to have any hand in letting the estate so much under value ; that I was not surprized at Mr. Shore approving such terms, because at a former meeting he had declared he did not care how low it was let ; but for Mr. Lee, which had promoted the advancing the estate and had declared at the meeting 8th Sept. 1756, that two different gentlemen had empowered him to offer the trustees 600l. per annum with a view to let it to under tenants. And further I added that Mr. Collins of Knaresborough told him that no lands about 'em was let under 10s. per acre, and if free of tythe 2s. 6d. more, which this is to the tenants, and will be equal to my valuation. I likewise reminded them of a lease in the trustees possession dated Nov. 17 Car. I. where the very estate was let for twenty years for 600l. per annum clear rent, and submitted it to their judgment whether lands all over the kingdom was not advanced since that time more than the difference betwixt 600l. and 895l. ; in short the meeting closed thus, that if I would not let the estate as above, they would let it themselves ; accordingly they have let it as they thought proper ; granted leases for twenty-one years signed by three trustees and one manager. The order stands yet in the book for my letting the estate uncanceled.*

“ Remarks on my valuation compared with Mr. Dawson's. My valuation of Lacock's farm 177l. Mr. Dawson's 120l. This farm they have let to different people to the amount of 189l. 6s. 6d. part of which lands was by them let to Lacock the old tenant for 63l. He makes an agreement with Benson to resign to him on condition of Benson giving Lacock a bond to pay him 7l. per annum during the lease, and the trustees have agreed to grant the lease to Benson knowing of this contract ; a proof I have not overvalued that farm. They have let lands on both sides of Benson's at 20s. per acre, why not Benson's sixteen acres for the same? Petty's farm, Malleson, to whom they have let this farm, offered me 10s. per acre for it which I refused. It contains 155a. 2r. Op. at 10s. is 77l. 15s. which they have let to him for 7l. 15s. less than he offered me. As to Wardman farm they have let it under what he had agreed with the trustees to pay for it when the rental was only 408l. as will appear by the agreement subsisting in the trustees hands. To sum up the whole, and to prove that I guarded to the best of my judgment on the one

hand against oppressing the tenants by overvaluing; on the other hand, by injuring the poor by undervaluing; I observe further the most material difference in Mr. Dawson's and my valuation lies the following farms. *Lacock's, which is let by them for more than I valued it. Gowland's, the difference is 73l. 2s. Pennington's the difference 49l. 13s. 6d. Hare and Holgate's farms they have joined together the difference in both 39l. 2s. Let the trustees choose out of these or any others which they think is overvalued, and I will take it myself and let it to an under tenant, they allowing me 10l. per cent. off from my valuation for expences in collecting rents and insurance of loss by tenants, calculated thus, 5l. per cent. for collecting rents and 5l. per cent. for losses by failure of tenants or non-payment of rent in time. But if I take to any farm I shall insist in the common drains being cleansed and deepened properly to carry off the water, as their is more than sufficient level for that purpose, as they the trustees know. I proposed for the tenants, and also for the benefit of the estate to be done at the trust expense, and the tenants to be under covenants to keep the same in good order during the leases. Since my refusing to sign the distributions and yearly accounts in this last year, they brought into the accounts 390l. And the year before that, a considerable sum under the denomination of the repairs for the estate at Haya Park; which papers neither shews what the repairs was, nor for which farms, nor was there any proposal made at any public meeting since these gentlemen came into the trust if any farms wanted repairs, there has been in this estate upwards of 1000l. laid out in repairs which was not finished above five or six years ago. I only desired a copy of the list of distributions last year and it was refused me; when the estate had 1000l. laid out in repairs what wood could be found in the estate fit for use, as not proper to cut, was marked and numbered; and what was wanted more than could be found on the estate, purchased, rather than fall trees unfit for use, young growing trees, in order to preserve for posterity. These gentlemen have cut down all before them without asking leave at a public meeting, and I am told has sold some. I had not known of wood being cut but by persons living near the estate and by talking since with the steward, he acknowledged all was cut."*

## The particulars of each farm.

As valued by Robert Moody.			The same by Mr. Dawson.		
Acres.		£ s. d.		£ s. d.	
241 0	Lacock's farm,	177 0 0		120 0 0	
16 0	Benson's	16 0 0		12 0 0	
15 0	Petty's	9 10 6		9 10 6	
155 2	Petty's	97 5 8		70 0 0	
52 0	Hare's	32 10 0		26 0 0	
308 1	Gowland's	163 2 0		90 0 0	
12 2	Bramley's	6 6 10	Omitted by Mr. Dawson.	6 6 10	
66 2	Wardman's	26 12 0		15 10 0	
81 0	Johnson's	48 12 0		32 0 0	
152 0	Holgate's	102 12 0		70 0 0	
198 2	Pennington's	129 13 6		80 0 0	
78 1	Becroft's	48 15 0		36 0 0	
56 0	Bruce's	35 10 6		26 0 0	
	A Croft a Coningstrop	1 0 0	Omitted by Mr. Dawson.	1 10 0	
	East College	0 10 0			
1433 0		£ 895 0 0		£ 594 17 4	

In the year 1824, this valuable estate let for 1200*l.* per annum, being below 17*s.* per acre. This certainly appears to be a very low sum, considering the situation of land so near to Knaresborough, and to Leeds also; and also that it let for 600*l.* in the year 1642, being 182 years ago. An opinion prevails in Yorkshire, that the estate is not let for its full value.

In reference to the Alms Houses Mr. Moody says, it was designed

“For nine poor widows of the age of fifty-five or upwards, and a poor man qualified to pray morning and evening with the widows, and to teach them the Assembly's Catechism. I have already observed that Mr. Cappe was chose\* sole minister of York, *contrary to the inclination of the serious part of the congregation, many of which left the place as they could not profit under his ministry. Some attend the preaching of the Methodists; others a serious practical preacher in the established*

\* Mr. Moody informs us in another Paper that until Mr. Cappe settled at York, there had always been two Ministers at the chapel in St. Saviour's Gate.



*Church*, the Trustees knowing this separation and found many that had voted for Mr. Cappe declining, *in order to keep up his party, they have assigned over the management of the Hospital, to this Mr. Cappe and four more of his party to strengthen their hands. So that the rules of the Hospital is totally neglected, and the character of the people put in, different to the design of the Lady. Either the last person, or the last but one that was put in, these persons agreed with a Gentleman that had a poor relation, to take her into the Hospital for the sake of 20l. : when I complained of this abuse, the Trustees made light of it. I am persuaded that the reason they go such extravagant lengths is, that as the trust Estates are made a freehold to the Trustees, they think no persons has a power to call 'em to account, especially if four or more are concurring in the same measures. I might begin with the first covenant in the deed of Trust, and proceed to the end and show how they have broke every one ; but it would be too tedious for a letter. I am fully persuaded that if this case was to come before a Court of Equity, the Trustees would not only be turned out of the Trust, but obliged to make good the losses the Trust has sustained by their practices.*

Speaking of the Leases, which he considered to be so outrageously below the proper rental, he says,

*“ I see plainly that this was done to force my compliance, to allow this young man, Mr. Cappe of York, 60l. per annum, out of the Charity. I begun to reflect whether it would not be more for the interest of the trust, to submit to allow this 60l. per annum, and be harmonious in advancing this Estate, for in the first case the Charity would lose 60l., in the second about 300l. ; and as all the other Estates was alike underlet, the loss of the Charity would be very great ; but when I considered on the other hand that all the Trustees had favourites to recommend, and might plead this President, there was no knowing where it might end ; but eventually as it was a notorious breach of trust to comply, I determined to oppose it and leave the event to providence. I therefore told them, I did not so much make a point of having the credit, of being the instrument in advancing the estate as having the work done, that as I found they was desirous of taking the management of the estate out of my hands. I would give*

them no opposition, but would readily resign to any person that would let the estate properly, but if they was determined to let the Estate at an undervalue, I should be under the necessity to oppose such measures ; they told me that the Estate was a freehold to the Trustees, and that a majority had power to dispose of it at discretion. Accordingly they voted Mr. Cappe 60*l.* per annum, and agreed to let the Estate as above. I have ever since refused signing the distributions and also the agreements with the tenants. I have been in this trust about 20 years, and within about 5 years we have had four new trustees, and no ministers are favourites with these Gentlemen *but such as are advocates for the Arian scheme* ; however we have kept within bounds till the last year, and in April last, when we met to make up the accounts for the preceding year, the estate was upwards of 300*l.* in debt, *and in that year the poor widows list was reduced to half, under a pretence as they called it of keeping out of debt.*"

*" I shall be ready to come into any method that is likely to answer the intention of the Donor ; if not, I am determined to give up the trust ; I am wearied with rowing against the stream. Inclosed you have a copy of the Deeds of Settlement, and if the Gentlemen desire it, I'll send them up a copy of the list of distribution, that they may see if they know the character of the ministers in the north in what way the Charity is disposed of ; they will find very few such as they or the Lady who left the Estate would have encouraged. I have often thought, especially of late years, that this Charity doth far more hurt in propagating errors, than the small part that's given the contrary way can do good."*

The papers shew an ardent desire on the part of Mr. Moody to redress these serious grievances, and he several times submitted the case to Mr. Attorney General Pratt, (afterwards Lord Chancellor Camden,) under whose advice he intended to institute a suit in Chancery, from which he was deterred, entirely by the heavy expence of such a measure. The following is an extract from a letter to a friend in London on that subject, viz :

" I am very sensible this suit, if commenced, will be a considerable charge, and therefore I have tried all other means to redress

the grievances before I thought of applying to the Court. At first I thought protesting against these measures, and refusing signing the distributions, would bring them to reflect and alter, but I find it had a contrary effect, *only enraged them and made them run greater lengths than perhaps they would have done if not opposed at all*; when I reasoned with them in attempting to let the estate at an under rent, and shewed them that by my valuation, I had not set the lands so high as the Gentlemen that have properties on every side of the estate, that are esteemed good Landlords let their lands, and as a farther proof, desired them to read the old Lease of this estate, granted 17 Car. I., for the clear rent of 600*l.* per annum, to a Gentleman of the City of York, and added it must be presumed those persons would not keep it in their own hands, and *live near 25 miles distant* from it; but that it was more probable they would let it to under tenants to an advantage! that the valuation I had made was 895*l.*, and *I submitted it to them if the value of lands was not encreased in all parts of the kingdom double to what they was upwards of a 100 years ago.* INSTEAD OF HAVING ANY RATIONAL REPLY ONE OF THEM THREATENED TO BREAK EVERY BONE IN MY SKIN. I use his own words, what I've related to you is but a small part to the grievances in the trust, two of the trustees are superannuated so that they are not capable of acting, one of them is the person by whom all the deeds, books, writings, and cash of the trust has been kept almost from the beginning," *One of the trustees in a private conversation told me two years ago that the estate was a freehold; that a majority had a power to dispose of it at discretion.* I informed him that I admit the freehold was in the Trustees, but the declaration of trust limited their power. While this notion subsists, no wonder to see them act arbitrarily; till of late years all resolutions of the Trustees of matters of moment at the meetings, was entered into a Book appointed for that use, but now all that is turned aside, and for what you can easily judge. I can assure you I am not fond of law, I suppose the best I am at a certainty of having a great deal of trouble, that if it was not for the sake of the poor ministers and widows I could not easily be prevailed upon to undertake it. If the court would not take notice of this, in no case can it be proper to apply for redress; then farewell charity! It is these estates the Lady has left that supports the dissenting interests in the northern counties, and

*whoever lives a few years to see it in the hands of the present Trustees, will find the bulk of it given to favourites that are no objects within the limits of the settlement, even this year they have reduced the widows list to one half that they might have room to gratify their humours."*

When I objected to Mr. Cappe not being an object of charity, and also laid before 'em the state of the last year's account, that by giving him 60*l.*, we had distributed 58*l.* more than the income of the estate, and that if we continued making that allowance this year, we should be double that sum in debt; this put a stop for a little time, *but they considered amongst themselves privately and resolved at last to take off from all the ministers' widows half their allowance in order to make room for that gentleman. I refused signing the distribution, and told 'em I could not consent to rob so many necessitous families in order to gratify an aspiring boy to keep a footman at the expense of charity."*

A list of these poor widows is with the papers; and by means like these, the Rev. Newcome Cappe introduced Unitarianism into York, and was supplied with a footman, "at the expense of Lady Hewley's Charity," designed for "poor widows of poor and godly ministers!!!" We do not profess to comment on deeds like these;—it is an unpleasant subject, let us pass on!

The doctrine of Lady Hewley's former Trustees, that the Trust property was their own freehold; and that a majority of their own body need not regard the direction of a Trust deed, but had a right to dispose of the property as they pleased, and of which Mr. Moody has spoken so indignantly, and so justly, is avowedly the sentiment of the Unitarian body at the present day.

It is easy to conceive that the unequal struggle between Mr. Moody and the other Trustees, could not continue very long. The Unitarian Trustees soon obtained the complete control of the funds, and for the last fifty or sixty years, these estates and the endowments upon the chapels founded for Orthodox principles by Orthodox men, have been the chief support of the Unitarian cause, in the North of England.

No account whatever has been given by the Trustees to

the public of their receipts and payments ; they account only to each other ; and whenever those disclosures are made, which cannot long be kept back, a system will be exhibited to the public eye, which will interest all classes.

Three generations of one family have served the office of Trustees to this charity, viz. The late Mr. Samuel Shore ; his son, Mr. Samuel Shore, senior ; and his grandson, Mr. Samuel Shore, junior. Cotemporary with Mr. Moody, there was a Mr. Thomas Lee in the Trust, there is a gentleman of the same name at present, and how many there have been between these two, we do not know. There are now two gentlemen of the name of Heywood in the list of Trustees ; but we are not informed how long they and their colleagues, Mr. Walker and Mr. Gaskell, and their ancestors, have presided over the distribution of Lady Hewley's Charity.

The following is Mr. Moody's account of the mode which was adopted in electing the first Unitarian Trustees, viz.

“Two\* Trustees are dead and thereupon the Trust then devolved upon the then surviving 4 Trustees and one Manager—And at a Meeting of the Trustees the 10th and 11th Sept. last it was proposed to chuse Managers in the places of the 2 deceased Trustees, upon which Mr. Moody reminded them of the clause in the settlement, which requires reasonable notice of all Meetings for transacting business of any weight or moment to be given to all the Trustees and Managers.—They replied that this clause meant no more than to bring all the Trustees together, and added that a Manager had equal power with the Trustees for choosing a Manager, and that the choice was to be determined by a majority. To which Mr. Moody rejoined that in the Deed of Settlement the *Trustees* are only mentioned, and to say the Managers are implied, is to say, That it is implied that the Managers are directed to convey the Estate, because the same clause that directs the former directs the latter, and a majority is not mentioned, but that *the Trustees* shall elect such a person as they in their judgments and consciences shall think fit and approve of. And he desired they

\* These two were original Trustees appointed by Lady Hewley.

would show how this article or clause could be fulfilled otherwise than by all the Trustees agreeing in the same persons.

“ Nevertheless they proceeded to an election *and the 3 Trustees and a Manager chose THE BROTHERS OF TWO OF THEM*, and ordered their Clerk to enter such choice in a Book appointed by the Deed for such uses and which was accordingly entered and signed by those 3 Trustees and a Manager.

“ As Mr. Moody disapproved of the two persons so chosen he mentioned\* two other gentlemen living in London generally known to the Dissenters as persons of property, integrity and judgment and such as he has no intimacy with. *That he might if necessary declare on oath he had no other inducement but the good of the Trust and desired the persons so mentioned by him might be also entered in the Book as his choice, which was refused.*”

It is probable the present Trustees would not disavow the preference which they give to Unitarian ministers, but a few illustrations of their conduct are necessary ; we therefore submit the following.

1st. The Alms-houses. There are nine old women admitted into this charity, and an old man, who reads what a correspondent ironically calls “ Mr. Wellbeloved’s prayers” to them. The women are understood to be old house-keepers, cooks, &c. of the Trustees and their friends and relations.

2nd. Poor widows of poor godly ministers.

3rd. To encourage preaching in poor places.

4th. Poor godly persons in distress.

5th. Exhibitions to young ministers.

The allowances for the four last mentioned objects are, as far as we have been able to ascertain, wholly enjoyed by the Unitarian body ; and we cannot learn that one farthing has been given of late years to persons of Orthodox sentiments, but it is possible that a few widows of deceased orthodox ministers may have received some aid, although we have not ascertained the fact to be so.

A person now living applied many years ago for an ex-

\* The Rev. Dr. Jennings and the Rev. Samuel Hitchin.

hibition, as a student, but after a series of questions relating to the doctrine of the Trinity, to which he replied that his sentiments were the same as Lady Hewley in her life time entertained, he was refused; another person, who was studying for the ministry, and had a large family, applied more recently, and was refused unless he would procure the recommendation of an *Unitarian* minister. The committee of the Rotherham Academy, for the education of young ministers of Lady Hewley's sentiments, which is situate only three miles from the building at Attercliffe, which once served for an Academy for the same purposes, and was conducted by Mr. Timothy Jollie, who was contemporary with Lady Hewley, an intimate friend of her ladyship, and to whose "School for the Prophets" it is obvious from her deed of settlement that she made special reference (there being no other academy in Yorkshire at that time) applied for an exhibition to her present Trustees, and the answer was, in effect, "the exhibitions are all filled—we have nothing for you;" Socinianism wanted all, and it has got all! Such was the danger that Lady Hewley's doctrinal sentiments would generally prevail, that her Trustees would not suffer a shilling of her charity to be applied to the education of a minister favourable to her ladyship's sentiments and opposed to those entertained by themselves.

The following gentlemen of the Manchester College, York, have received exhibitions from this fund, viz.

1818.	1821.
Mr. William Worsley	Mr. Samuel Heinekin (before named.)
— Charles Thompson	— William Wilson Do.
— William Wilson	— Richard Smith
— Samuel Heinekin	— John Owen Do.
— Richard Shawcross	— Edmund Kell
— John Owen	— J. Hugh Worthington.

• Her Ladyship's Book, Collection or System of Rules, Orders, Directions, and Instructions, subscribed with her own proper hand, and repeatedly referred to in the Trust Deed, *must* be in the possession of her Trustees, for they are expressly required to keep and conform to the same, and if they have not so done they are answerable for the violation of them.

The last objects of Lady Hewley's charity are "poor ministers of Christ's holy gospel."—Part of this fund is certainly received by ministers of Orthodox sentiments; the amount applied in this way is, however, very small and unimportant. An intelligent Dissenting minister in Yorkshire, says "*I imagine they give 100l. or 200l. per annum to Orthodoxy, by way of a blind, but latterly I have heard of their giving us little but refusals.*" The allowance in this way may possibly exceed 200l.; but the general opinion is, that it does not, and, as our correspondent observes "the Trustees keep their secrets close," so that it is impossible to state accurately what is the amount applied in the way which Lady Hewley designed it should be.

The Trustees pay little regard to the directions of the Foundress, that her bounty should be applied to the relief of "poor" ministers. Unitarian ministers, whose once Orthodox chapels are amply endowed, obtain assistance from this fund. One instance could be given of a Unitarian minister who receives from this fund, and yet has an endowment of three times the yearly amount of the entire salary received by another minister, whose application for relief to the Trustees was rejected, and no person can doubt that the reason was because he held the opinions of Lady Hewley.

In three instances, well authenticated, the Trustees allowed yearly sums to Unitarian ministers who once occupied chapels which had been built for Orthodox doctrines, and when two of those chapels became deserted by the Unitarians and the minister of the third became Orthodox, and all three were again occupied by Orthodox congregations, for whom they had been erected, Lady Hewley's allowance was instantly withdrawn.

To the minister of Rawtonstale Chapel, in Lancashire, (see Appendix) which was built by the Independents, for Orthodox principles, no allowance was made by these Trustees, until he became an Unitarian, and occupied the chapel in violation of the Trust deed, and then Lady Hewley's Trustees promptly granted him a yearly exhibi-



tion ; and at Malton in Yorkshire, the minister was allowed 10*l.* per annum, but when he avowed Unitarianism, the Trustees advanced him to 20*l.*

Fulwood Chapel, in Yorkshire, was built for Orthodox doctrines, but was once occupied by the Unitarians, when it had an allowance from Lady Hewley's Trustees. There was an endowment of 400*l.* which the Trustees, who were Unitarians, placed in the hands of a mercantile house, who failed, and the money was lost, for which, by law, they were personally responsible. There being only two or three Unitarian families in Fulwood, P. Gell, esq. in whom the Founder had vested the right of appointing a minister, at the request of a very great majority of the inhabitants, delivered it to Mr. Macdonald, a Trinitarian minister. In this case Lady Hewley's Trustees availed themselves of the poverty of the place, and *withheld* Lady Hewley's allowance until Mr. Macdonald engaged that the chapel should be delivered again to the Unitarians on his death or removal.

It would be endless to repeat all the vexatious occurrences of this sort. The complaints are all founded on one principle, viz, that Lady Hewley's Charity is applied in direct opposition to her sentiments, and in violation of the Trust Deeds, and the law of the land. Let any person read the funeral Sermon preached by Dr. Colton for Lady Hewley and the language of her will and trust deeds—let him consider what her intentions were when she executed the trust deeds—and then let him be informed that the Trustees apply her property to the support of men who placard in the public streets \* lists of lectures on subjects like these, viz,

“ Reasons for not believing in the doctrine of original Sin.

Ditto ditto in the Trinity,

Ditto ditto in the Divinity of Christ.

Ditto ditto the doctrine of the Atonement.

Ditto ditto the personality of the Holy Spirit.

Ditto ditto the Eternity of future punishments.”

and then let him give a honest Judgment on such conduct.

\* Placard of Unitarian lectures preached by Mr. Probert of Walmsly Chapel, Lancashire, (see Appendix) at Blackburn. The preacher receives 15*l.* per annum from this fund.

This charity is now become, by the present mode of mis-applying it, a bounty or premium for Socinianism ; and regardless of the directions of the Trust deed, that “ primary regard should be shewn to poor dissenting ministers in the northern counties,” the application of great numbers of worthy and excellent men in those counties are rejected merely because they entertain the doctrinal sentiments of the foundress, whilst Unitarian ministers in remote parts of the kingdom are eagerly rewarded for their opposition to those sentiments. We know that these funds are sent into the Midland Counties ; and probably Devonshire itself is deemed by the Trustees to be a “ Northern ” county, as a reward for its early apostacy from Christian truth ; and even for the few scanty pittances granted by the Trustees to poor ministers of orthodox sentiments, they have enforced upon some of the applicants the humiliating condition that they should previously obtain the recommendation of a Socinian preacher. No one can doubt that the corrupting tendency of these measures has been one great means of procuring the present perversion of so many of the Chapels in those counties where its influence has been chiefly employed.

And let any impartial person review the present circumstances of most of the northern Counties. In Cumberland there is not one Unitarian Chapel ; in Westmoreland there is but one, and that was once orthodox ; in Yorkshire there is only one Society (at Thorne and Stainland) which has been originated by the Unitarians, and that was effected by a “ Missionary,” Mr. Richard Wright, whose spirit was probably moved within him to see “ \*the darkness, the gross darkness of reputed Orthodoxy ” so prevalent in that county ; in Lancashire, their strong hold, they have originated only eight ; and in Cheshire two ; and even in the erection of some of those chapels, if report be true, Lady Hewley’s trustees have assisted.

The Unitarians have, however, brought over to their

\* Rev. G. Harris’s prefatory remarks published with his list of Unitarian Chapels.

purposes sixteen chapels in Yorkshire; thirty-one in Lancashire; and twelve in Cheshire; and upon these perverted chapels Lady Hewley's wealth is applied in rich and copious streams.

Most of the Chapels, thus preverted, are amply endowed; and those endowments and Lady Hewley's funds are obviously the cause of their present misappropriation. In the judgment of persons who have given some consideration to the subject, a great majority of the chapels, which are thus subsidized by Lady Hewley's Trustees, do not by any means average fifty stated hearers;\* though within memory, some of them contained large and flourishing congregations, when orthodox sentiments were preached in them.

To the support of such a mischievous system as this, the property of Lady Hewley is now chiefly appropriated; and the reader will judge whether, independent of all other considerations, the application of those funds to the maintenance of Unitarianism is not a public injury.

We conclude this article by calling the attention of our readers to the sentiments of a Mr. Edward Taylor, an Unitarian in Norwich, which he has published in the Monthly Repository. This person informs us of a Lady of Dr. Taylor's congregation, who left a sum of money in the hands of Trustees, members of that congregation, to be by them every year distributed in such way and to such dissenting Ministers as they and their Successors might think fit, with this restriction *only*, that they should be resident in Norfolk or Suffolk." A little more information about the trust deed, would certainly have been proper, but this he had his own reasons for keeping back; his object is to laud the Trustees for applying the money "*where it was most wanted*," which was plainly what was intended by the Donor; and for performing this act of duty, and for not

\* Mr. Harris in his Sermon admits that "there are more than a dozen Unitarian congregations (in Lancashire) that do not raise 50*l.* a year, each for religious purposes of any description." Probably they *do not* raise 5*l.* each per annum.

appropriating it contrary to the trust deed, these Unitarian Trustees obtain Mr. Edward Taylor's public praise!!!

With singular boldness Mr. Taylor asserts that the present controversy, "*must inevitably have the effect of depriving them (the Calvinists) of the advantages which they derive by their occasional union and connexion with us*" (the Unitarians)!!! What those advantages are, experience has informed us. Scores of Chapels built and endowed with immense labour and expence for the propagation of Calvinistic Sentiments, and thousands of pounds per annum set apart by Calvinists for the education and maintenance of their ministers, are by Unitarian Trustees perverted to objects and principles in direct hostility to those for which these costly sacrifices were made. These are the advantages, which have been derived from what Mr. Edward Taylor calls "occasional union and connexion" with the Unitarians! Cajolery like this must have provoked his own laughter; and his misgivings are obvious. It is evident he has nothing to offer in the way of *seduction*, and he therefore tries the effect of *intimidation*, and the haughty Socinian threatens hundreds of thousands of his fellow-subjects, if they dare to assert their legal rights, in the following terms; "Have they," he says, "reckoned up all the consequences which must result from the step they propose to adopt? LET THEM TAKE CARE. They have as yet only proceeded to words, but the moment the sword is drawn, adieu to all the ties which now bind us to them as brother Nonconformists. I say nothing of the unkind feeling which must be engendered where friendship and good will now exist; *I speak merely of the gross folly of their intentions; and I would advise them from mere motives of prudence to desist. The zealots who urged on this pillaging scheme, have very little notion of the extent to which their friends throughout the kingdom will instantly suffer. There is yet time for the reflecting portion of the Calvinists to interfere and put a stop to it. IF THEY NEGLECT TO DO SO, BE THE CONSEQUENCES UPON THEIR OWN HEADS*"!!! The reader will easily understand this Gentleman's meaning. He does not mean to

refer us to the \*225*l.* which he tells us was given in five years, but above twenty years ago, by Unitarians to aged dissenting ministers in Norfolk; he does not mean the loss which the "Calvinists" will sustain of anything which was ever given by Unitarians for any purpose whatever; *he means to deprive them of what is their own.* His wrathful eye is directed to *Lady Hewley's* estates, to *Dr. Williams's* estates, and to *other funds*, the greatest part of which by an unaccountable apathy of the dissenting body, in a nation where law and justice are respected, have been permitted to be perverted to objects which the founders of those charities loathed, and never regarded without horror. He predicts further innovations on these funds, and threatens that they shall henceforth be totally perverted. We, however, retort the Gentleman's own words, "LET THE TRUSTEES TAKE CARE." *The days of the triumph of injustice may be shorter than he supposes;* and the friends of Orthodoxy are already contemplating a proper course of investigation into this great Yorkshire Charity.

\* Mr. Taylor says that no *Unitarian Minister* has claimed on this Fund, and we conclude that when he wrote his letter, he did not know that *the family of one Unitarian Minister* has received more than the sum which he thus holds up to public admiration.

London :

MILNE AND SANFIELD, PRINTERS, 76, FLEET-STREET.

# PROPOSALS

ARE ISSUED FOR

PUBLISHING BY SUBSCRIPTION, IN FIVE VOLUMES 8vo.

*Price, 10s. 6d. each;*

HANDSOMELY PRINTED ON FINE DEMY PAPER,

THE WHOLE

## WORKS

OF

THE REV. OLIVER HEYWOOD, B. A.;

WITH A

*New and Enlarged Account of his Life.*

### THE WORKS

Consist of Heart Treasure—Sure Mercies of David—Life in God's Favour—Israel's Lamentation—Life of the Rev. John Angier—Baptismal Bonds—Meetness for Heaven—Family Altar—The Best Entail—New Creature—Job's Appeal—Heavenly Converse—General Assembly---Closest Prayer---Christ's Intercession---The Two Worlds; together with a Selection of unpublished articles from his Manuscripts. These will be edited by *the Rev. W. Vint*, Tutor of Idle Academy, Yorkshire.

### THE LIFE

Is written by *the Rev. R. Slate*, Stand, near Manchester, who has been favoured by Mr. Heywood's descendants and others, with upwards of *Twenty Volumes* of his Private Manuscripts, containing the History of the Heywood Family as far back as Mr H. could trace it. A Narrative of the first forty years of his Life---Soliloquies on various events during the first thirty years of his Ministry---A Private Record of the first Members and Covenants of the Church at Northowram---Numerous Personal Covenants---Remarkable Returns of Prayer between the years 1672 and 1702---Various portions of his Diary from its commencement in 1666 till within five days of his death, &c.

It is calculated that each Volume will contain, on an average, above 500 pages. The *First Volume*, though it may be published last, will contain The Life of the Author---The Life of the Rev. John Angier of Denton---and The Life of the Rev. Nathaniel Heywood of Ormskirk. A Portrait will be given of the Author, with a Fac-simile of his hand-writing, and a List of Subscribers' Names. The Second Volume is now ready for delivery.

### Subscribers' Names Received by

*The Rev. W. Vint, Idle, near Bradford, Yorkshire; The Rev. R. Slate, Stand, near Manchester, Lancashire; or at No. 10, Mabledon Place, Burton Crescent, Russell Square, London.*

Subscribers sending direct to either of the above will be allowed Twenty per cent., and receive their volumes carriage free. About 50 Copies will be printed on superfine Royal Paper, in extra boards, price 15s. each Volume.









